

# ***Yuletide Terror & Other Holiday Horrors***

*by*

***Frederick Meekins***

This book is dedicated to my mom, Bonnie Meekins, and my dad, Leroy Meekins, for embodying the generosity of the Christmas spirit towards their family the whole year through.

Copyright 2006 by Frederick B. Meekins

All Rights Reserved

## **No More Christmas Cheer?**

Americans had better enjoy this holiday season. It may be one of the last. If the forces of secularism, liberalism, and paganism have their way, the traditional celebration of the holidays that define us as a nation may become a thing of the forgotten past.

It's bad enough that these blasphemous philosophies disdain these celebrations vital to Western civilization. However, decent Americans must rise up against the desecration of their culture because these modern Scrooges want to take these sacred occasions away from everyone.

The holidays bearing the brunt of these attacks include Thanksgiving, Hanukkah, and Christmas. Each is being attacked for separate yet interrelated reasons.

The attack upon Thanksgiving stems from the mindsets of pantheistic paganism and multiculturalism.

The pantheist condemns the consumption of Tom Turkey because this viewpoint contends that we humans are no higher than the barnyard denizens along the chain of being and have no right to use animals for nutritional purposes. We are to eat vegetables, with Tom dining with us as an honored guest at the table.

Such concern over a silly bird, but nary a finger raised to defend the aborted child. One is forced to wonder if the vegetarians have been smoking the plants they so love to ingest.

The multiculturalist seeks to destroy Thanksgiving by advancing the notion that this feast was convened by the Pilgrims to pay homage to the Indians.

Wrong!!!

The Indians did help the Pilgrims survive the harshness of the New World. However, Thanksgiving was founded to thank God, the deity liberals love to hate, for allowing this group of pioneers to survive the many trials they endured.

Despite these attempts to destroy one of the most important events on the American calendar, the really big guns are brought out to destroy Hanukkah and Christmas.

Over the past several years, liberals and secularists have plotted to shut down democracy by having courts overrule towns on the issue of Nativities and Menorahs. However, the same liberals wouldn't dare remove the candles of Kwanza, a holiday established by Black radicals thinking themselves too good for Christmas.

The ultimate goal of this movement is to remove Christmas from the minds of public school children. No longer is the occasion referred to as "Christmas Vacation". It's now "Winter Break" to placate agnostics and pagans celebrating the solstice. Students of history might like to note that a similar policy was pursued in Nazi Germany as well.

And in some schools, as we shall later discover in this publication, students are forbidden from speaking the holiday's name under threat of punishment. Yet on a regular basis, these same students are introduced to New Age practices and American Indian superstition. If Christmas cannot be recognized, neither should the celebration of Halloween, which can degenerate into the glorification of its pagan roots in Satan, death, and evil if allowed to get out of hand.

Several years ago, the U.S. Postal Service, that epitome of government efficiency, issued a decree proclaiming it would no longer produce stamps graced with the visage of the Christ Child. The excuse was that the Post Office could not take denominational sides. So if these plans had not been thwarted by an outcry from the American people, the King of Rock and Roll (Elvis Presley) would have outranked the King of Kings (Jesus Christ) in the philatelic world.

While these conflicts are primarily symbolic and won't necessarily result in a new tax being levied, in a way the outcomes of these disputes do define us as a culture. America can either hold on to the traditional symbols of reverence and piety providing a sense of stability or the nation can toss them aside to embrace the symbols of liberalism and secularism that ultimately deify the state, resulting in anarchy and tyranny.

Over the course of the past century, the world saw evidence of this in the form of the Soviet Union. There in the past, like in the United States of today, religious symbols attesting to the Lord Jesus Christ were banished from public view. But instead of providing liberation, this kind of situation created such a sense of despondency that it was not unheard of in the days following Communism's alleged fall for some within the Russian government to cry out for American missionaries to rectify the moral chaos gripping the hearts of that once-daunting empire's population.

And in certain respects, it may be easier to set up a Nativity in Moscow's Red Square than in Washington's Lafayette Park.

### **Christmacide: The Autopsy of a Dying Holiday**

American believers can simultaneously take solace and find sorrow in the fact that the campaign to banish Christianity from contemporary society is well underway in other Western nations also. This is particularly evident in regards to the abolition of the public celebration of Christmas.

Students in America are not the only ones to have their yuletide enjoyment snatched out from under them. Similar educational policies are being pursued across the Atlantic in Merry Ole England.

According to Jackie Wullschlager writing in the *Spectator*, a British magazine of news and comment, Christmas has been virtually eliminated from the educational curriculum along with many other vestiges

of Christian culture. These things have been deemed inappropriate for public reflection by multicultural educationalists and other proponents of dogmatic tolerance.

Many British pupils do not know the Christmas story or even a single carol. The more secular symbols of the holiday such as Santa Claus, snowmen, reindeer, or even the elves have fared little better in garnishing publicity for themselves. One retailer blandly advertised, “holiday is here”, acting as if they were ashamed of the occasion but not so much so to willingly forego their share of yuletide prosperity.

One cannot argue that such is the cost of pluralism whereby public expressions of religious devotion are foregone so that individuals of all philosophical persuasions might enjoy a degree of equality in their private lives free of social coercion. British schools are in fact bustling with a considerable degree of religious activity.

The *Spectator* correspondent notes her daughter had participated in an assembly at her school recognizing the birth of Buddha, a celebration known as Wesak, but never in a school Nativity. Another festival now honored in British schools is Divali, a Hindu festival of lights commemorating the New Year.

There is more at stake than whether pupils learn “Jingle Bells” or how to deck the halls with boughs of holly. This issue will ultimately determine the character of Western civilization in the years and decades to come. One must note this opinion did not necessarily originate with rabid fundamentalists.

Jackie Wullschlager writes in the *Spectator* article, “Christianity is both the bedrock of our culture and a reference point at least for our spiritual values.... The Bible is not just a great book; it occupies symbolic status --- it is the book by which we swear to speak the truth in a court of law.”

She goes on to point out that without a knowledge of Christianity it is impossible to understand masterpieces of Western culture such as Da Vinci’s “Last Supper” or Handel’s “Messiah”. And I might add that without a comprehension of Christianity it is impossible to understand the spiritual theses underlying the more profound manifestations of popular culture such as “Star Wars” or “Babylon 5”.

The *Spectator* article declares, “My children are in danger of being deprived of their cultural inheritance because a tyranny of political correctness has driven out of schools traditions that have sustained people for centuries.”

If Western education refuses to take advantage of the opportunity provided by Christmas to transmit our Judeo-Christian heritage and values to the next generation, our civilization could very well end up being overrun by competing systems of thought not so squeamish about propagating their beliefs and not known for caring about whose liberties they squash in the process.

## **Termination Claus**

Use to be that Americans sat around during the Christmas season waiting for the first snowflakes to fall. Now there is almost as much anticipation to see what silly things ridiculous activists are going to get offended over in their rush to see who among their ranks will outdo the Grinch or Scrooge in perpetrating a holiday hullabaloo.

In the past, debate has raged within certain Evangelical circles about their relationship to the decorative symbols of Christmas accepted by most in the wider population, especially Santa Claus in particular.

However, Christians might be surprised to learn that they would do well to re-embrace these festive emblems as strategic rallying points in the wider culture war as the same forces of radical agnosticism bent on sweeping Christianity into the sociological sinkhole have now set their sites on these theologically peripheral yet culturally endearing motifs.

The City Council of Kensington, Maryland ended that municipality's longstanding tradition of having Old St. Nick light the local Christmas tree. The primary reason was that two families found this jolly old elf offensive; not so much because they felt this character trivialized the sacredness of this occasion celebrating the birth of Christ, but because the symbol was perceived as too religious in nature.

Why is it that whenever humanists and other hostile heathens get offended the whole show comes to a screeching halt, but when conservatives find their deepest values attacked in the form of perverted sex education or in diversity training derogatory of the White race they are expected to sit there and even smile about it? To paraphrase the admonition used to dismiss parents raising concerns regarding the broadcast filth polluting the media airwaves, those repelled by Mr. Claus and his entourage are not compelled to watch.

Yet in Kensington, secularists did not state their case through crude anti-religious rhetoric alone. Instead, they embellished their case with an appeal to patriotic sentiments.

As with a number of other issues not even related to counterterrorism, the tragic events of September 11th are invoked as an excuse to irrevocably alter the fabric of American life. This time it relates to Yuletide celebrations. One member of the Kensington town council told WUSA TV 9, the Washington D.C. CBS affiliate, that we are living in a "post-September 11th" world --- bring those words up and you can get by with anything --- where we can no longer revel in holiday frivolity. Instead firefighters, police officers, and postal workers ought to receive the honor of lighting the tree.

Don't take this the wrong way, but frankly haven't firefighters and policemen gotten their share of attention lately? It's not like their contribution in this time of crisis has gone unappreciated. There is little reason to alter absolutely everything.

Numerous journalists have died covering the war on terror. Geraldo Rivera himself nearly bought the farm over there. Does that mean the editor of the local paper should get to flip the switch? A number of Christian ministries rushed to New York to address the overwhelming spiritual trauma to be found at the World Trade Center site. Does that mean a local member of the clergy deserves the honor?

Heaven forbid that last option. For you see, the Kensington celebration was to be so secular in nature, the *Washington Times* noted, that the band would not even be playing "Jingle Bells" lest some liberal fall into atheistic apoplexy. Nor would traditional ornaments such as stars or angels be adorning the tree. These would be replaced with patriotic songs and red, white, and blue lights. Look hard enough and you'd probably find a hammer and sickle as well.

While liberals have typically had little use for the United States other than as a laboratory in which to carry out ghastly sociological experiments, they are perhaps at their most dangerous when they feign patriotism or seek to impose their version of it upon the remainder of the population. Without the sense of personal tranquility provided by belief in a sovereign God standing above the fray and confusion of history, this world and its institutions are the only things secularists have after all. They possess no greater authority; they sense no higher hope.

According to the *Washington Times*, the Kensington cabal does not even have the decency to call it a Christmas tree --- it's a "secular tree" all in the name of tolerance and inclusion. It's enough to make you puke.

Ecclesiastes 3:1 says, "To everything there is a season and a time for every purpose under heaven." Christmas is not the Fourth of July or some other occasion on the calendar designed for the purpose of expressing vital patriotic sentiments.

While those who lost their lives through terrorism and those sacrificing to protect the United States from this evil should be remembered on this special day, this does not mean we must revolutionize the fundamental nature of Christmas or obliterate this day's unique brand of joy. In his efforts to console the nation, President Bush has continuously emphasized the need to get back to life as normal. There is no need to sit around as sour-faced as the Taliban; unless of course liberals and secularists ultimately wish to exert this same degree of absolute control over the American people in their own way.

### **Politically Correct To Alter Santa Out Of Existence**

Over the course of the past decade or so, leftist malcontents have set their ideological sites against Christmas no doubt as the holiday points to the birth of the Savior Jesus Christ who can often help or motivate the individual to work through many of their own problems without an over reliance on government aide and because many of the celebrations if not taken to extremes provide the individual with a sense of well being that undermines liberalism's basic assumption that things are so miserable that the only hope of fixing them is handing control over to a state imbued with almost God-like powers.

Initially, many of these challenges and objections were couched in terms of the canard of the Separation of Church and State and all that other pluralistic mumbo jumbo about not offending other cultures even though the rest of us have the other cultures jammed down our throats the rest of the year to the point where if anyone objects to allowing hordes of radical Muslims or swarms of illegal aliens to settle here without question now you the one likely to be labeled a troublemaker or a threat to national security.

But now that the average American has just about enough of the efforts to banish the foundations of American culture even if they do not embrace the underlying worldview of these foundations, more crafty subversives are beginning to come out from beneath their dank rocks like cunning serpents to play on those abridgements of freedom already accepted by the good-natured but slightly dimwitted if they desire status as progressive members in good standing with the COMMUNITY.

Beloved by all but the most puritanical or revolutionary from either extreme of the socioreligious spectrum, even Santa Claus is no longer immune to postmodernist deconstruction.

In years past, some have sought to eradicate him as a symbol of the Christian ethos in which the icon either sprang up in or was grafted onto. However, rather than outright obliteration, the more crafty now want to alter his fundamental nature in such a way that most of us will no longer recognize him once our politically correct overlords have their way with him.

Those following the news first caught wind of this in a story from Australia where Santa Clauses from Downunder were forbidden from uttering "ho ho ho" because it might be "offensive to women" since other than a jolly greeting it is also slang for a woman of ill repute.

Though I'll have to admit I have also used it as a double entendre for comedic effect in a column about a strip club participating in a toy drive, frankly, if you are going to sit around and raise a fuss over this jolly phrase apparently the plight of women is so good here in the civilized lands of the West that there is nothing left to complain about.

As a recent country song laments there was a time when "a hoe was just a hoe." The rest of us should not have to be punished because of the success of the Jerry Springer and Maury Povich Shows in popularizing ghetto slang in the broader culture.

Most probably just stand back and scratch their heads at that one. However, the jolly old elf is now threatened by a new campaign those conditioned to blindly accept what those in lab coats and carrying clipboards will have a more difficult time countering.

Inherent to his accepted appearance along with his thick white beard and usually velvety suit is that Santa is renowned for being a bit on the stout or pleasingly plump side. However, in the attempt to pressure us all into being malnourished little minions of the New World Order, those now running a number of these agencies, regardless of whether or not the government even hold such influence, have declared war against Santa Claus.

The U.S. Surgeon General said in an interview to the Boston Globe, "It is really important that the people who kids look up to as role models are in good shape, eating well, and getting exercise."

All Americans --- just not parents with children of Santa believing age --- should step back for a moment and cogitate upon this magistrate's pronouncement. This statement not only applies to an icon trotted out once per year; for if the statement is taken to its logical conclusion it could be applied to anyone a little thick around the middle.

Should Oprah trot back up the scale again, does that mean she must forfeit much of her influence and stop playing her new role as "False Prophet" to Obama's "Pseudo-Messiah"? More importantly, if this size bias continues to percolate, will there come a day when those deemed as overweight will be forced out of prestigious careers or professions? Even worse, will overweight parents lose visitation rights in divorce proceedings or even have children snatched from the home all together?

Furthermore, if the Surgeon General is going to come out against the impropriety of obese Santas, why doesn't he also come out against supposed role models exhibiting other behaviors deleterious to health?

For example, if the obese are to be banished as role models, does this mean the same should be done about the sexually promiscuous in the media. Teens and adults, I think, would be more prone to emulate provocative behavior of that fashion since all physically healthy folks have lots more urges pushing them in that direction than a pre-school child would to want to look like Santa Claus who will just be an innocent playful memory too soon enough in a few fleeting years.

It seems the gift some could use the most this Christmas season is a little bit of good old fashioned common sense.

## **Unwrapping Innocence**

Once upon a time, I wrote a column about the impropriety of airing prophylactic advertisements during

Saturday morning children's programming. Aficionados of the moral debauchery into which our nation is descending snapped classic animation is no longer directed at young children but rather towards libertine post-adolescents with less control over their urges than barnyard animals. Some unable to muster a rational argument instead chose to disparage my personal appearance.

Even if the viewing public must concede dominion of old favorites to these reprobates, does that mean we must stand by and yield all quality programming to those who want to drag us down to their level?

Typically, broadcasters have had a tradition of airing quality programming during the Christmas season. Usually, parents don't have to expend much moral anguish as to whether or not the innocence of their children will be compromised through viewing these often cute or touching shows.

However, as in regards to the older Saturday morning adventures of yore now under new custodianship, it is my contention that the ethical peril lies not so much with the content as it does with the commercials.

The *American Girl* books have received considerable acclaim as quality literature depicting the lives of young girls during the nation's early years in a manner reminiscent of *Little House On The Prairie* or *Anne of Green Gables*. As with other successful literary properties that have come before it, this one has made the transition from bookshelf to film as a new television movie produced for this special time of year titled "Samantha: An American Girl Holiday

Sounds like a night of enjoyable, worry-free TV, doesn't it? Such an assessment would be incorrect.

While the movie was itself well-done and will no doubt become a Christmas classic and hopefully spawn sequels, many parents --- at least in the Washington Metropolitan Area watching channel 50 --- were no doubt flustered when they either had to avert the attention of young eyes and ears or face having to answer questions about birth control pills or feminine hygiene products.

Call me old fashioned or out of touch, but I think a parent should be able to sit down to watch a children's show without having to explain what a tampon or maxipad is to a seven year old. Furthermore, what's the point of advertising these things anyway since they have a captive market to begin with whose demand is not going to fluctuate any appreciable degree due to persuasive advertising.

Disgruntled feminists cannot dismiss such criticisms as sexist, chauvinist, misogynist, or what ever other label they might throw around certain times of the month to intimidate cowering males. Most women I know of frankly find those kinds of commercials embarrassing. Even NBC anchor Brian Williams, hardly a pawn of the religious right, revealed on *The Sean Hannity Show* how he did not like such intimate matters discussed during commercial breaks.

In the movie, the grandmother chides Samantha for inquiring about the private life of the family servants. While contemporary social relations shouldn't be characterized by the same degree of contrived hyperformality, a little Victorian modesty might do everyone a bit of good and would be a gift this season that would give the whole year through.

### **Teats For Tots: Holiday Season Gets Whole New Kind Of Ho Ho Ho**

When shoppers head to the store during the Christmas season, it is assumed the price is borne by the party giving the gift. However, should these yuletide bequeathals originate from questionable sources, the price

extracted can in fact be too high for the recipient.

Though allegedly an act of selflessness and altruism, the act of gift giving is as much about bringing praise and a sense of self-satisfaction to the giver. The act, in fact, bestows a degree of legitimacy upon the giver in the eyes of the receiver and can boost the ego or esteem of the party giving the gift.

This oft-denied reality bounced to the surface one Christmas quicker than a Hooter girl on a trampoline when the even more ribald counterparts of these risque serving wenches attempted to create a favorable impression of their questionable profession.

In 2003, floozies from Teaser's strip club distributed toys at the Statesville, North Carolina housing project. The following Christmas, however, administrators declined donations from these purveyors of the lust of the flesh.

The problem is not so much with these loose women and their patrons wanting to spread Christmas cheer to children who allegedly won't have anything under their trees (apparently these people have never heard of dollar or thrift stores) but rather the way in which these seductresses have gone about doing so in the past.

Often those playing secret Santa deposit their gifts on the doorsteps of the economically challenged, never revealing their identities. No doubt that is why the word "secret" is emphasized; apparently there's something about the concept ditzy blondes cannot seem to grasp as they distributed the gifts in such an ostentatious manner that they would make a pimp's tailor blush.

Instead of quietly distributing the gifts under the cover of evening, these ladies of the twilight showed up in limousines and scanty outfits. Those opposed to these titillating histrionics were accused of having a 1940's mentality (certain aspects of which might actually do us some good).

But perhaps even worse and even more shocking is one of the sources of support for these women of questionable repute. Pastor Jeff Porter of the First Baptist Church of Statesville told the *Record and Landmark* that the holidays are when differences are to be set aside because "Christmas gives us the chance to cross barriers for the less fortunate. The Bible is full of times when folks of all backgrounds took one step closer to God by acting like Jesus."

In other words, we ought to set aside our most cherished values and beliefs. Interesting, isn't it, how those holding to traditional standards are expected to lower them rather than requiring those in the gutter to elevate themselves. The Bible is indeed full of examples where individuals of all backgrounds "took one step closer to God by acting like Jesus."

However, such accounts of redemption were only accomplished by committing one's life to the standards to which Christ has called us. It may come as a shock, but there is more to the Biblical message than the proto-Marxian redistribution of goods and property of the hippy Jesus promulgated by apostate ecclesiastical syndicates such as the National Council of Churches.

While Jesus did stress the need to assist the downtrodden, even more central to His message was the condemnation of sin throughout the course of His ministry. Thus, how can individuals claim to be acting in the Lord's name when they don't believe sin actually exists? For if they believed sin did, they would not take their cloths off in public or advertise that they do so without embarrassment.



Jesus kept His pants on. Shouldn't those eager to follow His example do the same?

Try as religious liberals might to excuse various transgressions such as homosexuality and fornication by obfuscating Biblical injunctions against these acts, there is little that can be done to deny the connection between acknowledging one's sin nature and the shame of public nudity.

In Genesis 2:25, before falling into sin, it says Adam and Eve were naked and not ashamed. But after eating of the forbidden fruit, Genesis 3 tells us Adam and Eve realized they needed to conceal their bodies now that sin pervaded every aspect of their being.

Ever since that day our first parents felt the need to cover up their privates, only two groups have countered the moral need for clothing. On the one hand, there are the ignorant such as the *National Geographic* jungle savages who know no better, and on the other hand, are those who unabashedly flout the standards of propriety and decorum.

The deep theological ramifications of nudity in the current dispensation aside, is it really wise to glamorize careers in the sleaze racket as impressionable young eyes look on? If you have no problem portraying strippers and exotic dancers in a favorable light and as pillars of the community, would you like your daughter, sister, or mother to take off her clothes for a living in front of a bunch of dirty old men?

Furthermore, would you feel comfortable accepting Christmas gifts from a stripper who goes out of her way to make sure you and your child know she is a stripper? If not, why not?

Interesting how the most effusive proponents of hedonistic solipsism become as prudish (sometimes even more so) as the rest of us when their own children are involved. Kind of like how Madonna won't let her own children watch TV but has made a career of thrusting her own bosoms into the face of the American people.

It has been said there is no such thing as a free lunch. The same could be said of gifts as well. For even though such items do not cost the recipient anything in terms of money, they can extract a price in terms of the indebted loyalty they end up demanding.

## **Happy Tolerance Day!**

That's right --- "Happy Tolerance Day." There use to be a time of year when Americans greeted one another with a hearty "Merry Christmas". However, if the minions of political correctness continue to foist their intellectual swill upon the nation's culture, the Yuletide season will come to symbolize something else entirely. On "The O'Reilly Factor", Bill confronted feminist agitator Patricia Ireland about Planned Parenthood's "Choice On Earth" holiday cards. Ireland responded by saying, "I can't think of a better time of year to remind everyone of the need for tolerance among the major religious groups and among individuals."

Planned Parenthood concurred with Ireland's assessment in a statement posted on the group's website concluding, "Planned Parenthood believes in every individual's right to make choices and live in peace with our planet and wishes people of all beliefs a peaceful and safe holiday season." If NOW and Planned Parenthood hags are out fostering a spirit of diversity and tolerance throughout this festive period, I'd hate to see an organization imposing a uniformity of thought.

These groups and their liberal sympathizers are out to promote something this Christmas. But it's definitely not goodwill and human understanding, especially if tolerance and inclusion mean celebrating ideas you don't necessarily agree with as diversity advocates harp ad nauseam.

Planned Parenthood said of the arm of the American Life League publicizing the scandal of these blasphemous Advent placards, "...this organization ... serves no redeeming purpose." If Planned Parenthood really "believes in every individual's right to make choices", who are they to say an organization serves no redeeming purpose when the ethical standards endorsed by the abortion crowd are reducible to the pragmatics of relativistic individualism?

As with its other varieties, it seems the Christmas brand of tolerance does not apply to those embracing America's traditional Christian values either. One New Jersey school cancelled a trip to see *A Christmas Carol* --- talk about a bunch of Scrooges --- because Christian references might offend non-Christian students. Should the same degree of concern be shown to the sensibilities of Caucasian students disturbed by the unbridled racial histrionics allowed to run rampant all February long and for much of January and March for that matter?

The school's spineless principal told the *Atlanta Journal-Constitution* that this literary classic "did not mesh with the class' curriculum [no doubt because Dickens being a dead white male]." and "there is a great sensitivity to putting students in awkward situations." Wonder if these mental sensors will be as quick to cut sex-ed and evolution from Biology class.

This prejudice has taken on such ridiculous proportions that these Grinches have metastasized beyond the holiday's outrightly religious message to take offense at its symbols once providing a great deal of aesthetic joy.

According to Robert Knight in the Nov/Dec. 2002 issue of *Family Voice*, this hatred towards God and all things holy runs so deep that many retailers refuse to place stars atop their display trees as a conscientious effort to thumb their noses at the King of Kings. Even Chick-fil-a, the fast food chicken chain that makes a self-righteous spectacle of itself by closing every Sunday, barely acknowledged the existence of Christmas for a while.

In Pittsburgh, concerned residents there had to fight to get annual December celebrations re-upgraded to a generic "holiday" status. Humbugs in that Pennsylvania metropolis had reduced the Christmas season to a mere "Winter Sparkle Festival", going so far as to downplay traditional decorations in favor of stars and sparkles.

In Australia, a number of daycare centers won't let jolly Ole St. Nick darken their classroom doorways for fear of offending immigrants and minorities. Instead schools emphasize culturally inclusive figures such as Fairies and Elves.

Most adherents of these minority persuasions are not native to the Land Down Under. They should have known what they were getting into before they migrated there. Westerners are always being lectured as to our need to honor other cultures. Isn't it about time those from the backwards nations of the earth reciprocate with due homage and deference?

A "spokeswoman" for the Swinburne University of Technology in Melbourne told the *Sunday Mail*, "As a university, we have to be sensitive to the views of minority groups." But won't the majestic and ethereal

Elves portrayed in *The Lord of the Rings* feel unjustly stereotyped if pre-school students see the primary function of these beings as wrapping presents and baking cookies? And what about the Hobbits; won't they feel their culture diminished by all the attention focused on the Elves? The last thing you want to face, my friend, is a gaggle of disgruntled Hobbits.

We can all sit back and laugh at this --- unless of course mirth has become yet another celebratory quality banished by the ranks of the politically correct --- but these conflicts have ramifications beyond entertaining us on cold December evenings. These secularists hope to expunge every religious reference from society's vocabulary in the hopes of enshrining their own dogmatic absolutist tolerance as the established creed.

At Patuxent Elementary in Lusby, Maryland, my cousin's son was sent to the principal's office for uttering "God bless you" after a classmate sneezed. School officials informed my irate cousin, who was called up to the school in the same manner as if her offspring had cussed out his teacher, that her son must desist in offering this traditional benediction since it offended atheists and Jews in the class.

Thus, my young cousin was forbidden from vocalizing his own religious culture and ethos. Yet for the school to have known the preferences of these unbelieving students, someone must have expressed them.

So why are they allowed to speak up and Christian children ordered to remain silent? More importantly, if Christians are told to no longer enunciate idioms harkening back to the religious origins of America's culture since doing so would be to impose them upon those who do not share them, why are those who do not have Christian convictions allowed to impose theirs upon the rest of us? What if a Christian child is offended by some atheist brat who refuses to button their lip?

Some might consider making tolerance the best thing they could find under their tree (or whatever other green thing makes them warm and fuzzy all over) this "holiday season". However, as everyone that was once a child eventually realizes, not every gift is all it's cracked up to be.

## **Out of Sight, Out of Mind**

In the attempt to foster an unreflective pluralism, it seems those things making America the greatest nation on earth are being lost or even purposefully forgotten.

In a story appearing in the December 21, 2000 edition of the suburban Maryland *Gazette* newspapers titled "December brings many festivals", considerable hullabaloo was made over Hanukkah, Kwanzaa, and Ramadan. Yet Christmas wasn't even mentioned.

While it may be appropriate to publish an article regarding these celebrations, the article's own thematic layout promoted an intentional oversight of Christmas.

Some will snip an examination of Christmas is not warranted since most Americans already celebrate the holiday. But do they know its true purpose commemorating the birth of the Savior Jesus Christ?

An article in the British *Spectator* revealed many school children in that nation possess scant knowledge of this sacred day. If it's my obligation to learn about other religions, isn't it about time Jews, Muslims, and even secularists did so regarding mine as well?

These competing holidays cannot be promoted and Christmas then excluded on religious grounds because these others also propagate specific spiritual beliefs --- even Kwanzaa with its Afrocentric spin on socialism as epitomized by the festival's emphasis on collective work and cooperative economics. You work for yourself, not the bum on the street corner with the little cardboard sign who refuses to provide for himself (no wonder Africa is in economic shambles).

If this nation wants to truly serve as a haven for diversity as depicted by much multicultural propaganda, then Americans must understand the Christian principles allowing our freedoms to exist in the first place. For freedom will cease to exist if we rush to embrace principles and ideals alien to the American way of life.

### **Eco-Claus: Greens Emphasize Red In Christmas**

In *The Lion, The Witch & The Wardrobe* by C.S. Lewis, the White Witch forbids the celebration of Christmas in part because she thinks the celebration is a waste of resources. Likewise, in *Politically Correct Holiday Stories* by James Finn Garner, Scrooge is as much a New Age acetic as he is a miser.

A classic song entreats the listener to have themselves a merry little Christmas. However, if certain environmentalists have their way, Americans won't be enjoying much of a Christmas. For according to these elites, the Christmas festivities most of us enjoy are to be listed on the indictment of environmental crimes of Western Civilization against the ecosphere.

These leftists who have made an entire cottage industry insisting that right and wrong do not really exist certainly don't mind telling the rest of us what to do. Published in the December 2005 edition of *National Wildlife* is a proclamation the reader is expected to adhere to if they wish to observe an environmentally-aware solstice season or whatever else the tree huggers wallow in this time of year.

Some of the suggestions are just commonsense tips on how to save money on electric bills. Others are more blatantly agenda driven.

University of Edinburgh climate scientist Dave Reay is quoted as saying, "Consumption of everything...spikes enormously in December, from extra car trips, to overpackaged foods, to electronic kitchen gadgets that nobody needs."

Of course, the pilgrimage to the bookstore to acquire the professor's book is still one of the few permissible excursions allowed beyond the confines of one's domicile. One speculates whether Professor Reay himself owns any of those swanky-dank kitchen gadgets "nobody needs" or still cooks his food over an open spit and campfire after capturing it by his own hand. But then again, if past experience is to serve as our guide, liberal bigshots making such grandiose proclamations of a seemingly progressive nature such as how environmental catastrophe looms unless we alter the fundamental way in which we celebrate Christmas seldom abide by their own decrees.

Yet these self-anointed overlords don't stop at telling us how we will be permitted to get around or how we will be allowed to prepare our sustenance. In fact, it is their desire to tell us what we may consume as well.

Towards the close of the *National Wildlife Federation* article, this fruitcake professor intones that mere commoners are to avoid eating foods not indigenous to one's respective biome since provisions shipped

long distances increase greenhouse emissions. Likewise, consumers are admonished to eat less meat since it takes away land that could be used for other agricultural purposes.

If they attended the 2002 Earth Summit in South Africa, I wonder if delegates from the National Wildlife Federation partook of the 5,000 oysters, 1,000 pounds of lobster, 80,000 bottles of mineral water, 4,000 pounds of steak, 1,000 pounds of sausage, 450 pounds of salmon, and buckets of caviar made available for the attendees who usually get their jollies condemning the rest of us for how much higher on the food chain the average American eats than the rest of the world. But then again, I guess they'd tell us they deserve such special treats more than the rest of us since their consciousnesses are so much more advanced evolutionarily than our own.

Unfortunately, such lunacy does not confine itself to the babbling idiots that hold the vast majority of positions in education, the media, and public interest groups. Such lunacy has a way of turning into the stuff policy dreams are made of.

And while these grandiose declarations often find themselves promulgated by the highest levels of the global elite, don't get the impression that these directives will be confined to matters far removed from your everyday existence. For even now local governments believe it is their place to dictate to us how we are to celebrate Christmas for the sake of the environment.

The recycling manager of Carroll County, Maryland told the local paper there that the county recommends residents "Cut out unnecessary details, and don't buy extra things or impulse items that you don't need while you are out shopping." Frankly, it's none of the government's business what I do and don't need. The role of the government is to crack open the heads of violent criminals endangering life and property, not to play Martha Stewart or provide hints from Heloise as to proper Christmas etiquette and decorum.

But while many within government at various levels prefer we adhere to a regimen of frugality over the course of the Christmas season not so much for the sake of our own pocketbooks or in the name of our good credit records but rather for the sake of the COMMUNITY, certain officials will blow more in a single season than entire family lines will spend over the course of multiple generations. For by the time Christmas season 2005 comes to an end, the President and First Lady will have hosted twenty-six Christmas parties according to Slate.com.

At the White House, 30,000 cookies will be eaten by 9500 guests. And President Bush is a president not exactly known for his profligate ways; just imagine how much more was consumed during the more conservation-oriented but hedonistic administration of Bill Clinton and Al Gore.

Supporters will snap, "So? Many of these functions are supported by private funds." But so are our own Christmas celebrations and government officials certainly don't mind telling us what they think about how we commemorate December festivities.

And in response to increasing fuel costs, President Bush has suggested Americans cut back and tighten their belts to do their part for the benefit of all citizens. As the head of state, shouldn't he be willing to set an example? A good place to start might be by cutting out these shindigs for multimillionaires whose lives are one big party to begin with anyway.

Those brainwashed into accepting dutifully whatever the elites tell or demand of them will dismiss these

observations as mere class envy. However, average Americans would not begrudge the rich and powerful so much for what they have if these self-appointed Overmen stopped taking it upon themselves to tell us what to do with the little that we do have.

The best gifts are those that satisfy the deepest longings of the heart. The best present any level of government can give us during the holiday season is to stay out of our business as to how we celebrate Christmas.

### **Liberals All For Tolerance & Understanding So Long As You Agree With Them**

Many contemporary liberals have taken it upon themselves to advocate tolerance and understanding as the highest social values. Such self-professed ambassadors of magnanimity usually extend these principles to everyone except those they disagree with.

Each year, my columns addressing the attacks upon the Christmas holiday elicit a number of emotional responses. My essay expounding the attempts by environmentalists to stifle enjoyment of the Advent season prompted a number of ultrapluralists to expose their true colors.

One such critic began, “This article...was too full of name calling, stereotypes, and mean spiritedness. It is very opinionated and one sided. Rang of the all too familiar ‘Rush Limbaugh’ lets bash everyone who is not like us.”

While it is an honor in the context of the column in question to be compared to Rush Limbaugh, I ask you is not the offended pluralist the one engaged in “name calling, stereotypes, and mean spiritedness”? Of course, my column was “very opinionated and one sided”. It’s suppose to be one sided; that’s why it’s called an “opinion piece”.

There is no “Fairness Doctrine” that applies to commentaries and editorials. If someone wants to consider what the other side has to say and has way too much time on their hands, one is perfectly free to consult the *National Wildlife* article I originally referenced.

Interestingly, this insistence upon objectivity is usually only imposed upon conservative thinkers and ideologues. I don’t remember the *National Wildlife* or *Carroll County Times* articles clarifying that holiday over-consumption was merely the opinion of a few disgruntled academics and activists with other scientists feeling differently about the matter.

Furthermore, who is a scientist to say something is too much or not enough since it is not the place of science to make such value judgments? When they do, they veer off into the realm of philosophy. Nor do I remember an evenhanded approach being taken by this professed disciple of evenhandedness.

The criticism does not stop here and proceeds on in a similar vein. The comment continues in its haughty progressivist tone, “It lacked any reference to the obligation commanded to be good stewards, it offered no options or alternatives.”

Firstly, there is no provision attached to the First Amendment saying one has to sit there with your mouth shut unless you have a solution to the problem you feel the need to speak out against. Sometimes the best solution to a problem that really isn’t much of a problem is not to apply any solution at all. Some things just really aren’t any of the government’s business.

Americans have been celebrating Christmas for quite a while now. Why all of a sudden do we need the government and tenured professors telling us how to celebrate it?

There is far more waste going on in society (often in government) than whether or not I buy a present someone really doesn't need apart from the pleasure I will derive seeing the joy I will bring into the life of the loved one I decide to give the gift to. Furthermore, who is to decide whether or not I need that extra present --- Barbara Streisand or Arianna Huffington as they live on their palatial estates and ride around in limousines?

Claiming this is a matter of Christian stewardship is stretching that concept in some areas and misapplying it in others. The Apocalypse won't result if I use a little too much wrapping paper or have an extra slice of pumpkin pie. There is no reason to be wound that tight.

If someone is going to get all worked up into a twitter that Christmas as commonly celebrated is a misuse of resources worthy of widespread social intervention, shouldn't they be spending the most valuable commodity they'll ever possess --- namely their time --- in a manner far better than responding to online blogs? To paraphrase a classic adage, those who can, write blogs; those who can't, post comments.

Better yet, if every decision we make is to be characterized by the utmost sobriety of Christian stewardship and responsibility, should those that feel this way even have the Internet at all? Wouldn't that \$20 a month be better spent elsewhere if we are going to get all jacked out of shape that someone bought at extra DVD this Christmas instead of sending a check to some televangelist so he can buy another gilded throne for his set or more pink hair dye for his wife?

The criticism continues, "it [the original column] offered no options or alternatives." Other than people minding their own business as to how others spend their money at Christmas time, what other alternatives are there?" I am not the one calling people to change the way they live their lives in terms of this issue to make Al Gore happy or whatever else it is an emotional Popsicle like him happens to feel.

Back in the days before we were conditioned into thinking government, academia, or the media knew how to run our lives better than we do and when people went to church to hear about their individual relationship with God and not about the imperatives of submitting to the glories of the community, people use to make decisions like how they'd celebrate Christmas on their own. Seems the communitarians are as thrifty with backbones as they are about allowing people to enjoy themselves without Big Brother staring over their shoulders.

This effusively sensitive ascetic concludes by exhibiting a bit of an elitist streak by saying of the commentary, "Too-done too many times and there wasn't any new voice in the piece." In other words, if someone at a pay-grade above yours has already said something similar to what's on your mind, you'd better keep your mouth shut.

Frankly though, isn't everything said since ancient times simply variations on a theme? Alfred North Whitehead said all of Western thought is but a footnote to Plato and the Bible puts it as there is nothing new under the sun. Since that's the case, if liberals really cared all that much about the various forms of pollution including that of unneeded noise, shouldn't they cease their yammering as well?

Winston Churchill is credited with saying the following: under 30 and conservative, you have no heart; over 30 and liberal, you have no head. The worldview espoused by liberals is so devoid of logic and

commonsense that they themselves refuse to adhere to the rigors and demands which they expect those of us of inferior intellectual caliber to themselves to abide by.

## **Racial Revelry**

Imagine, if you will, for a moment: a holiday established to celebrate White people simply for being White. During this celebration, White people sit around and ponder so-called “White values” and bask in the glorious accomplishments of White European civilization.

Most Americans would think such chicanery had been cooked up by the Ku Klux Klan, and rightfully so. Yet, Kwanzaa is spreading across the United States in the Black community and few dare raise concerns as to the issues of equality such a race-specific holiday poses.

As alluded to in the opening comments, if a Caucasian counterpart to Kwanza existed, it would be deemed patently racist. And if American culture is to live up to the standards of equality, Kwanza must be labeled as such also.

Justification for this assertion is readily available in light of the statements made by a number of the holiday’s supporters in the December 27, 2001 edition of the suburban Maryland *Gazette*. The individual organizing Kwanza activities at the Hillcrest Heights Community Center fondly told the *Gazette*, “...black folks always had a togetherness.”

When White folks tend to congregate with one another, we are at best chastised as to why we ought expand our ethnic consciousness or at worst face the business end of a civil rights lawsuit. Yet there is more wrong with Kwanza than the ritualification of the human tendency to gravitate to others of your own flavor. Its errors begin at the level of ethical philosophy and extend downward towards its methods of cultural socialization.

One Largo, Maryland resident told the *Gazette*, “We have always had a need to connect to our heritage as Africans living in America.” Such blatant anti-Americanism cannot simply be dismissed as the ramblings of a raving street lunatic. This attitude climbs straight to the top of Kwanza’s ladder of leadership.

Dr. Maulana Karenga, the festival’s organizer, told the *Gazette*, “I created Kwanza ... to reaffirm our rootedness in African culture and the fact that as Africans we come together to reinforce the bonds between us as a world African community. And to celebrate the meaning and beauty of being African in the world...”

Some Germans use to have their own movement through which they sought to unify Germans around the world for the sake of their Germaness. It was known as the Nazi Party.

Don’t dismiss this as a stretched analogy. The sentiments expressed by National Socialism and the vaunted principles of Kwanza already share a startling similarity.

Two of Kwanza’s days center around the concepts of collective responsibility and cooperative economics, two notions embraced by all forms of socialism inimical to free people everywhere. For example, collective responsibility implies one bears guilt for the transgressions of others, allowing lowlifes to get off scot-free since it’s everybody’s fault but their own; cooperative economics essentially means I am entitled to what you’ve got even if I refuse to lift a single finger in pursuit of earning my own livelihood.



Granted, Kwanzaists have not yet cut the same swath of death, destruction, and mayhem as parallel revolutionary movements. But as the quicksand through which the initially unsuspecting are swept into the radical perspective of Black nationalism, this festival is now laying a foundation that could justify the abridgement of generally accepted notions of equality and principles pertaining to the rule of law. The propensity for this is already there.

Dr. Karenga is himself quite a piece of work in this regard. After devising Kwanza, this academic pursued more idiosyncratic recreational pursuits. According to WorldNetDaily, Karenga was convicted of torturing two women by stripping them naked, beating them with an electrical chord and a karate baton, and pouring detergent down their throats. Even if the rumors of Jefferson's affair with Sally Hemmings were true, I am sure the widowed third President treated her with a gentleness lacking in the character of this degenerate heralded by pluralists everywhere.

This tendency among Black nationalists to trod asunder innate liberties and traditional social institutions is evident in the purported African axiom highlighted in the *Gazette* article, "that all children in the community belong to everyone and that every adult should take responsibility for children." In other words, your progeny do not belong to you and the authorities are able to step in whenever your values and presuppositions run counter to communal writ (Hillary's hootenanny that it takes a village). The Biblical conception of the family is tossed by the wayside in the process.

The purpose of Kwanza, is after all, to erode support for Christian beliefs and principles within the Black community. The Assistant Director of the African American Cultural Center told the *Washington Post*, "It's inclusive enough to be celebrated by many faith communities. And it continues to bring people together on the common ground of their Africaness." This means many Black congregations are being sold out to Islam.

Already Louis Farrakhan's cronies blacklist Black pastors who refuse to play ecclesiastical ball with his wacky Islamic sect. And several years ago, CBN News aired footage of Farrakhan exegeting a number of Biblical passages as to how he himself fulfilled a number of prophecies pertaining to the Messiah.

Anyone who says it's not Kwanza's purpose to undermine Christianity and replace it by enshrining "Blackness" as the highest ideal doesn't know what they are talking about. Already a number of Afrocentric agitators have abandoned Christmas in favor of an exclusively Kwanza-based holiday season. These militants claim they prefer the collectivism of this competing celebration so they do not have to endorse capitalism, rather exchanging books instead of traditional Yuletide gifts. Bet you though they won't be reading enlightening tomes by keen Black thinkers such as Walter Williams, Larry Elder, or Thomas Sowell.

The horror and tragedy of September 11th will forever stand as the price for allowing alien philosophies hostile to the United States to trample across our land without question or criticism. Now is the time for each American --- regardless of color --- to decide for themselves whether they will embrace the ideals of Western Judeo-Christian civilization upon which this country is based or those whose sole purpose is to undermine this great nation.

### **County & City Sponsor Festival Promoting Racism**

Blacks get all of February and most of January for all that matter as they fill the time from Kwanzaa at the

end of December through Martin Luther King Day and the time leading up to Black History Month. Hispanics get most of October. Now even Asians, once considered the model minority for their former tendency to provide for themselves and not expect the rest of us to fill their outstretched hands, get their own month to wallow around in what they are. As usual, the White man gets forgotten in all of this as it becomes his duty to sit there quietly and simply nod in agreement as to what a wretched human being he is.

With a goodly portion of the year given over to ethnological naval-gazing and denigration of the Occident, one would think even the most fanatical multiculturalists would grow weary of all this and find another way to entertain themselves over the weekend. But in Prince George's County, Maryland in general and in the City of Hyattsville there in particular, it seems the minds of liberals are so one track they can't ever get too much of the same thing.

The weekend of July 10, 2004, the first annual Heritage Carnival of Prince George's County will be held to celebrate "...the culturally diverse experience of African, African American, American Indian, Brazilian, Caribbean, Filipino, Italian American, and Latin American cultures. " For supposedly being held for the purposes of, as Municipal Liaison for the County Obie Pickney told the *Gazette*, "...uniting Prince George's County as 'one people, one community'," most Caucasian groups --- especially those of Northern European extraction --- are conspicuously missing from the list.

In order to be "one" as county propaganda urges, don't you have to include Whites also? After all, though we might be fewer in number than we use to be, we all haven't died off yet. Liberal racemongers will have to wait a while longer before they can celebrate our ultimate demise and finally forget about us all together.

The dogmaticians of diversity will respond that, if we are to enjoy an age of brotherhood and understanding, we can no longer look to race or ethnicity as a source of personal value and individual identification. If we are to ever be truly equal, we must think of ourselves as human beings only.

Why, then, are those who exploit such a sentiment to the greatest extent organizing a festival where certain minor cultures are deemed more worthy of celebration and study than those from which the nation's values, institutions, and way of life actually derived? Our children, as well as ourselves, would be much better off learning about the constitutional ideals of the Founding Fathers than about how some insignificant African tribe with a name hardly anyone can pronounce shakes their boodies around the camp fire.

But then that's probably the point about holding a celebration such as the Heritage Festival. By filling our minds with entertaining trivialities, those in power hope we won't realize what's going on and, even more importantly, what we might be able to do to correct the situation.

Those assembling around diversity as the highest principle of social organization don't exactly muster the keenest argumentation in defense of their questionable cultural assumptions. For example, Prince George's County Executive Jack Johnson writes in support of the Heritage Festival, "Our county's population is the most diverse of any jurisdiction, and our greatest asset."

An area or country is not great because of its alleged diversity but in spite of it. Isn't greatness, as Martin Luther King whom professional racialists usually just about deify noted, determined not by the color of skin but by the content of character?

Aren't race and color just accidents of birth and do little in determining what kind of person an individual will become? Both Walter Williams and Mumia Abu-Jamal are Black; but the first happens to be one of the wittiest social and political commentators of our day and the second a skuzzy-looking cop-killer convicted of murder.

Leftwing social engineers have conditioned the American people to applaud any minority conga line coming down the pike. Maybe it's time we stepped back and examined such volkish posturing.

Suppose for a moment there was a population of pale-skinned redheads. Should we assume it is their redheadedness that endows them with their values and skills? Should we hold pale-skinned redheaded history month and convene pale-skinned, redhead festivals since in the past pale-skinned redheads weren't appreciated as they should have been since most of us have heard of things denigrated by likening them to redheaded stepchildren?

Seems silly, doesn't it? Then why do we put up with such silliness when Blacks or Hispanics are involved?

Even if you lack the courage to stand up for true American ideals in this age of radical tolerance, the spineless citizen can still oppose the Heritage Festival on purely economic grounds if they have not been fully communalized into thinking their tax dollars are better off in the hands of officials with no intentions of spending them frugally or wisely.

As of August 7, 2003 back when the Festival was planned for Sept. 26-28 but was called off as a result of a hurricane mercifully sent by Providence, the City of Hyattsville designated \$12,000 to help defray Heritage Festival expenses. Though I can't really say for sure if the City council eventually reneged its pledged contribution in the year ensuing the Festival's September cancellation, such an outlay of revenue is foolish in light of the hoopla over the municipality's looming budget crisis.

Though property tax rates remained the same for 2004, that was not decided until there was a multi-session debate where members of the police and firefighters' union paraded their sob stories before the public access cameras of the televised meetings lamenting how their pensions would go under-funded unless conscientious residents did the civic-minded thing by agreeing to higher property assessments. Maybe if the Council made their legitimate expenditures their top fiscal priority instead of surrendering other people's money to trendy elitist causes just to show everyone how politically correct they are and how guilty they feel about being White people, maybe they'd have enough to properly reimburse those who actually do the city's assigned tasks. Before you put the statutory gun to my head demanding I fork over more, make sure you've properly spent what I have already been forced to give you.

Neither diversity, nor its accompanying heavy-handed approach to social organization, made American great. Rather that is a distinction that belongs to the individuals who realized that they couldn't expect the group or government institutions to float their boats on the seas of life.

We should not trample the memory of such valiant pioneers by patronizing a festival designed to undermine our identity as Americans while robbing us of our financial resources in order to do so. Rather the spirit of hearty individualism should be honored by keeping government sponsored activities to a minimum, allowing the productive to retain more of what's theirs to begin with. That would be something we could all celebrate.

## **When Did Black Become A Christmas Color?**

It has been said that socially Evangelicalism is five to ten years “behind” the broader culture. John Warwick Montgomery once remarked that America was where old German heresies went to die, meaning that eventually the intellectual refuse of the elite came to infect the American church no matter how reluctant the bride of Christ in the United States might have initially been to such doctrinal fads.

Back in the 90’s, Evangelicals looked on in astonishment as Postmodernists from lofty chairs in academia went about undermining the notion that one should not be judged by the color of one’s skin but rather by the content of one’s character. Instead, these deconstructionists suggested that one should be assessed primarily as a member of one’s herd and judged in light of either the sins or disadvantages of one’s forefathers.

As a result, whereas in years previous those of certain backgrounds struggled to take their place in and recognized as full members of society, the trend reversed itself and those skilled in exploiting past resentments were able to shame the majority into allowing certain demographic classifications to cordon themselves off as they saw fit while denying this proclivity to the members of the most numerous group. Though conservative Christians initially bucked such a trend by admonishing that it is ultimately the individual that Jesus died and rose from the dead for and will whom be judged, they too are now succumbing to this social pressure.

Among Evangelicals eager for the accolades of the elite, one popular refrain invoked to show just how tolerant certain leaders can be is that 11 am Sunday is the most segregated hour in America, bemoaning the fact that most Christians prefer to worship with members of their own ethnicity even if they do not harbor blatant ill will or hostility to their fellow coreligionists of different backgrounds. Upon closer examination, one will see that it is a condemnation few ashamed of being White are reluctant to level at minorities as well.

Despite the fact that many denominations do not have the demographic ratios those so obsessed with race to prove to the world that they are not obsessed with race clamor for, a number of them do have memberships consisting of a variety of ethnic groups. But instead of capitalizing on this situation by not harping on racial differences and allowing believers to find their own dynamic equality, those running these religious associations as their own private ecclesiastical syndicates refuse to let sleeping denominations lie and hope to accrue power for themselves by playing the same racial spoils game popular in more liberal circles.

Commemorating the birth of the Lord of all mankind and the Savior of believers from every nation, tribe, and tongue, one would think that all Christians could celebrate Christmas without reference to color. However, even this cherished festival is degenerating into a front for radical social engineering.

On December 2, 2006, the Mid-Atlantic District of the Church Of The Nazarene held an African American Christmas Dinner. To those conditioned into embracing such directives from their handlers without question, such an affair might not seem all that out of the ordinary. But unless chitterlings and collard greens are going to be the main course on the menu, does an African American Christmas differ all that appreciably from the Christmas of any other American group?

As to whether or not a denomination should be hosting such a function, we should ask ourselves would it

be appropriate to convene a “Caucasian” or more precisely, a “European American Christmas Dinner”? If the prospect of such an event leaves you a bit squeamish (as it probably should), then why do we put up with or, shall we say, tolerate such extravaganzas when they are convened for groups more favored by the ruling clique?

In James 2, the believer is warned against showing favoritism and in I Corinthians 11, the church is admonished regarding these matters in reference to the Lord’s Supper and meals eaten in His name. If this command applies to something that may be earned such as wealth, how much more so in pertaining to a characteristic the individual has absolutely no control over.

### **Yet Another Celebration Pandering To Minorities**

In promoting racial equality, it is often harped that on the inside we are all the same regardless of color or background. Apparently that isn't quite the case since we are now being bombarded by yet another celebration pandering to minorities.

Minority Transplant Organ Awareness Day (try putting that on a greeting card) seeks to, well, raise awareness of transplant organs for minorities. While one can hardly oppose the quest for good health, like many other causes promoted by the liberals, this one should also be subjected to closer scrutiny and critical thought.

For starters, if we are going to have a Minority Transplant Organ Awareness Day, shouldn't we also have a Caucasian Transplant Organ Awareness Day? Not every White person that needs a transplant organ gets one either.

So why is it inherently more regrettable if this tragedy befalls a minority than your run of the mill White person? Furthermore, if there was only a single organ available, can anyone justify why Jesse Jackson would be more deserving of it than Ted Kennedy? Even more importantly, are those White bigshots that enjoy imposing minority favoritism on the rest of us in order to show how enlightened and progressive they are going to forego an organ for themselves or a loved one in favor of a minority should they ever find themselves in such a situation or is this merely another burden they expect to pass on to the average White American?

From the way these public campaigns are expressed, you'd think the average White guy was as immortal as Duncan MacCloud of the Clan MacCloud from the *Highlander* series. However, seems to me White folks drop dead from the same afflictions.

In one news account justifying this day of ethnic guilt, one AP story laments that American Indians make up 34% and Hispanics 42% of those awaiting kidney transplants in New Mexico. Maybe if these communities learned to lay off the booze a bit, they could reduce the numbers instead of shifting the blame to Whitey.

Even among conservative circles, it is now popular to claim that racial differences do not exist. While that should be true in the eyes of the law, if it is so in terms of biology, shouldn't organs be interchangeable between various groups if these distinctions are nothing more than arbitrary cosmetics?

Seems this issue will force the proponents of radical multiculturalism to make a decision in favor of either their fantasies of absolutist egalitarianism or the system of demographic spoils they have devised to

ultimately lavish power on themselves as the administrators of a new ethnic feudalism.

## **Stop Restricting Holiday Language**

Over the course of the twentieth century, Americans worthy of their citizenship stood in opposition to global Communism as manifested by the former Soviet Union. A primary reason for that stance was that nation's violent opposition to religious expression. Now that empire lies in ruins with various factions competing for the shattered pieces. However, the specter of opposition to free religion, though weakened, still hovers ominously over the earth.

During the Christmas season, Christians everywhere stand ready to capitalize upon the evangelistic opportunity this holiday readily presents. But it may come to their surprise that their governments have been known to mobilize against such efforts.

For example, a few years ago it was reported in the press that an Alaskan school forbade its students from uttering that raunchy profanity, "Merry Christmas". Instead students were to vocalize the linguistically bland "Season's Greetings".

These developments have in no way confined themselves to Santa's backyard. According to the American Center for Law and Justice, students at one elementary school were required to delete references pertaining to divinity mentioned in "Joy to the World" with a hum as if the phrase was a talk show vulgarity. This is about as ridiculous as forbidding the mention of Blacks during a Black History Assembly.

These attacks upon this sacred occasion are nothing new. For years secularists have petitioned for the removal of nativity scenes and menorahs while their ACLU compatriots have advocated the normalization of child pornography.

The invocation of the Separation Clause doesn't cut the nutmeg. For years public schools have advocated occultic practices such as meditative visualization and a reverence for the earth transcending the necessity to pick up after oneself.

In light of these demonic practices, one little carol won't hurt, unless of course the public educational establishment harbors an agenda other than education.

Furthermore, concerned citizens wanting to stand in opposition to these trends must note that the Supreme Court has ruled that secular humanism is itself a religion and educational programs regarding religious holidays do have a role to play in a fully-orbed social studies curriculum.

Christians should rise to proclaim the importance of this holiday in defiance of any secularist regulations or mandates. If Herod could not find the Christ Child, surely a bunch of babbling liberal buffoons cannot thwart the movement of the Spirit --- either Christmas or Holy.

## **Interest Group Scrooges Ruin Christmas Season**

The Christmas season used to be a time when individuals did what they could to spread good will to all men. In today's post-Christian era, however, it has degenerated into a contest to see what liberal interest group can raise the most stink about being offended.

Groups such as the American Civil Liberties Union have attacked nativities and menorahs displayed on public property. Meanwhile, secularists in some areas have literally positioned themselves to erect displays depicting the threat posed to the First Amendment by Jerry Falwell and Pat Robertson.

But as these forces have raised such a fuss that those too squeamish to stand by their convictions utter "Season's Greetings" instead of that vile profanity "Merry Christmas", their ideological kinsman now wish to abolish the more secular symbols of the holiday as well.

Buckling under pressure from the Humane Society, the National Park Service in 1996 decided not to display reindeer at the Pageant of Peace and the National Christmas Tree on the Ellipse in Washington, DC.

Before you know it, environmentalists will ban the Yule Log because of the carbon monoxide or chlorofluorocarbons being released into the atmosphere. Don't laugh. In some areas, officials already regulate the use of fireplaces on bad air days.

The removal of the deer destroyed a Washington tradition that stretched back decades. Animals regularly played a prominent role in these festivities. When I was a child, one year I remember visitors could feed corn to livestock such as sheep, llamas, and goats.

Secular humanists have already tried to remove the message of Christ --- the very reason for this annual celebration in the first place --- from these national festivities when a ruckus was raised over a nearby nativity. Now they have successfully emancipated Santa's herbivore labor force.

It won't be long until some eco-knave complains about the holiday lights and gaudy decorations impinging upon the innate dignity of the tree itself.

### **Scrooge Elementary**

Amidst the rancor of the nation's ongoing debate regarding education, the charge is often made that students from private or homeschool backgrounds are not as "well-rounded" as those matriculated in the competing public alternative. Yet in reality it may be the public institutions sending forth a graduate inferior in terms of both overall knowledge and character.

The point of formal schooling is the acquisition of knowledge for the purposes of being able to understand the nature of truth and to acquire the skills necessary to survive as an American. However, many educators instead think it is their duty to censor the knowledge presented to their students in order to present a vision of reality sanctioned by prevailing scholastic philosophies.

This trend is evident in the policies and opinions regarding the recognition of Christmas expressed by a number of Washington area public school officials. These statements are not falsehoods constructed by conspiracy theorists seeking to undermine public schools. They in fact come from the December 12, 2000 edition of the *Washington Post*.

From the category of outright distortion, one official from Mount Vernon elementary said, "I think everybody knows by now that we can't have anything of a religious nature. I try not to use the word Christmas. We talk about our winter break. We are having a winter holiday music sing along."

Coming in at a close second in this category was a Howard County, Maryland principal who said, "Religion is not part of the curriculum at the middle school level. And we don't do anything associated with holidays."

So for that matter, I trust these schools will be foregoing their recognition of the Martin Luther King holiday and Black History Month since neither of these occasions can be understood properly without referencing the religious motivations of this particular group of people. After all, despite his numerous character flaws most are too afraid to address, Martin Luther King was a Christian minister. The *Washington Post* did a public service in highlighting the insights of two credentialed and positioned educators who caution that the study of religion has no place as a part of a balanced education.

Fortunately for the sake of an educated population, these educators devoid of true learning are notoriously incorrect. Bill Clinton, hardly a friend of sound doctrine or upright morals, released Department of Education guidelines clarifying that the study of religion is an essential component of cultivating cultural appreciation. Whether or not educators implement these guidelines or cling to their agnostic misconceptions is another issue.

If students can dress in Egyptian regalia and take part in a mock mummification ceremony as has been shown on Prince George's County, Maryland Public Schools' public access channel, then there is nothing wrong with Christmas cookies and punch. For it must be remembered that mummies were the means whereby bodies were preserved for the afterlife in ancient Egypt, clearly a religious practice.

Other school officials have made it their professional goal to eradicate what little joy might still remain nestled somewhere in the academic calendar.

One Montgomery County, Maryland principal has to win Scrooge of the Year for saying, "I just don't think the holidays are part of the schools anymore... We focus so much on academics that you don't have the freedom in school to do much of anything on it." Funny how academics are played up this time of year but take a back seat when it comes to leftwing concerns such as community service requirements, multiculturalism, and the distribution of birth control paraphernalia.

An administrator from Washington, DC's Eastern High School perhaps provided the clearest explanation for just what motivates these people. The educator said, "I will probably get a Christmas tree and put it in the hall. ... There is no Christian or Jewish philosophy attached to any of this." Would they object to another religion as vigorously, say Islam for example? Better yet, will they seek to downplay the atheism rampant in the study of evolution?

Despite revealing an inexcusable historical ignorance since Christmas trees are replete with Christian symbolism as are many other yuletide decorations, such a statement clearly exposes the hostility to Judeo-Christian belief at the heart of much of public education.

Secularism and socialism, the intertwined ideologies motivating the aspects of these policies not resulting from blatant stupidity, can be said to be totalitarian in nature. This means they seek to exert control over all areas of existence.

Even the very games children play are not immune from scrutiny. According to the December 8th *Washington Times*, the schoolyard classic dodge ball is close to joining a growing list of academic faux pas that already includes such traditions as honor rolls, graduation prayers, and individual school



supplies (some school districts practice a bit of realized Marxism by compelling students to forfeit supplies purchased for their own use into communal stashes).

Much of the opposition to this game of choice is more a philosophical objection than a concern over the physical welfare of pupils. Much of the criticism stems from the fact that dodge ball is competitive in nature and the last thing public schools want to imbue students with is a sense of individual achievement and initiative.

Education today is about communitarianism as embodied in the asinine number of group projects students are required to participate in. But as one critic of classroom communism has pointed out, writing is not a team sport. And neither is real life for that matter. The group does not pay your bills nor does it provide you with the accoutrements needed to enjoy life in a free society such as a house or an automobile.

Some may find linking the abolition of Christmas with the prohibition of dodge ball a bit absurd. However, Christian thinker Francis Schaeffer once remarked that contemporary Christians often fail in seeing the whole picture. The pedagogues of revolution do not in their effort to recast the fundamental natures of man and society.

And in conclusion, one of the greatest gifts parents can give their children this Christmas season is to take them out of government schools where this kind of nonsense has taken the place of traditional forms of character development and academic accomplishment.

### **Tis the Season (For Double Standards)**

During the Christmas season, the conflict for the soul of America comes before the public's attention unlike any other time of year. This realization is particularly evident as the events of September 11th and their aftermath prompt even the most detached of Americans to contemplate with a renewed seriousness the clash of civilizations taking place right here within our own borders.

While most Americans have responded to the terrorist attacks by reexamining the religious and philosophical foundations upon which true patriotism rests, a number in positions of influence are headed in the opposite direction for the purposes of undermining America's strength as a unique nation and distinct culture by attempting to bestow extraordinary rights and privileges upon those who perhaps pose one of the greatest ideological threats.

The New York City public school system announced plans to set up special prayer rooms in which Muslim students could commemorate Ramadan. While school authorities ensured that these rituals would not be allowed to disrupt classes, the *New York Post* pointed out that students "could have their schedules altered to avoid missing class." Newsmax.com noted that students would more likely be allowed to cut class all together.

One might hope that such a spirit of openness and magnanimity would be extended to other religions as well. But I wouldn't hold my breathe.

Gary Bauer, former presidential candidate and head of OurAmericanValues.org, noted in his "End of the Day" email newsletter dated 11/15/01 that the New York City public school system ranks among the most hostile towards Christian students daring to express their own beliefs. And it must be remembered that this is the same public education racket that disciplined a teacher for daring to console her despondent

students that a deceased classmate had likely gone to heaven.

Fortunately though, some good may come out of this inane hypocrisy. Because of the outrage generated within the Christian community --- among both Protestants and Catholics alike --- the New York City public school system claims to have suspended the Ramadan concessions for now.

The sad part is it took over 3,000 innocent lives, a serious blow to our way of life, and the looming curtailment of our liberties to get our attention as to the dangers of an uncritical acceptance of multicultural pluralism. For you see, these Ramadan prayers went on sanctioned in previous years in New York City public schools without similar accommodations provided for practicing Christians. This year, though, it has become an issue of cultural concern --- at least among media outlets legitimately concerned for the nation's well-being.

Furthermore, this campaign to placate those out to undermine both America's traditional values and religious foundations has not confined itself to New York City where one expects to find such kooks, weirdos, and half-wits. This scholastic poison seems to be seeping into the administrative policies of other school systems as well.

For evidence, one only need checkout the Prince George's County, Maryland school calendar for the year 2001-2002. December will be of particular interest.

For on the 16th, the school system lends official recognition to the Islamic celebration of Eid Al-Fitr commemorating the conclusion of Ramadan by annotating the holiday on this academic chronology and by prohibiting the scheduling of tests, meetings, or special activities.

Christmas, on the other hand, is not even explicitly mentioned. The dates of the 24th to the 28th are glossed over as "Winter Break" as if this were a euphemism providing cover for something shameful.

Students do get Good Friday and Easter Monday off in April, but the calendar begrudgingly lets it be known that this is only because of the higher authority of Maryland state law. The statutory origins of other holidays such as Martin Luther King, Jr. Day are not alluded to.

Pluralists cannot parade around like Ramadan is a swell deal then back away from Christmas using the Separation of Church and State as an excuse. The law shouldn't allow it.

According to the Family News in Focus article "Religious Aspect of Holidays Not Taboo" by Bob Ditmer posted November 15, 2001, it is well within the confines of the law to discuss the true meaning behind key American celebrations such as Christmas without having to cower behind multicultural mutterings excusing ignorance beneath ominous clouds of tolerance run amok.

Eric Buehrer of Gateways to Better Education told Family News in Focus, "Teachers can teach that Thanksgiving is about being thankful to God... They can teach about the birth of Jesus at Christmas."

So why are liberals out to undermine Christmas while going out of their way to promote Ramadan if for no other reason than to erase America's Biblical heritage?

As Americans, peaceful Muslims deserve the same rights as other upstanding citizens. Yet as a nation founded as an outpost of Judeo-Christian civilization, they do not deserve special privileges denied the

remainder of the population.

## **Peppermint Prohibition**

As political correctness continues to manipulate our culture to the point where one is afraid to invoke the traditional response to a sneeze for fear of sparking a constitutional crisis, many of the religious symbols of Christmas have drawn considerable fire.

However, symbols now considered religion-free are also coming under attack because they also possess faith-based histories.

One Christmas season, my cousin informed me that the innocuous candy cane was more than a mile-marker demarcating the geography of the North Pole. This holiday confection is itself laced with religious symbolism as the red stripe running down the peppermint represents the cleansing blood of Jesus Christ and the neighboring white depicts the purity found within that precious fluid and the One slain in order to bestow its grace upon all whom would receive it.

In return, I informed her that the three loops of the twisted pretzel represent the three-in-one nature of the Holy Trinity, no doubt causing this baked good to one day be removed from public school lunch menus. I also deduced that one day the candy cane would probably go the way of the Creche as a shamed part of our “best forgotten” Christian heritage.

Little did I know at the time two students at a Gaithersburg, Maryland school had been forbidden from dispensing candy canes with literature informing recipients as to the religious origins of this traditional treat. Had the two been dispensing Kwanzaa paraphernalia or pamphlets attesting to the veracity of evolution, school authorities would no doubt have looked on with approval.

Culture primarily results from the intermingling of language and religion. There are radicals seeking to block efforts to establish English as America’s official language, even though it is the world’s lingua franca. A related movement now seeks to eradicate the civilizing influence of religion.

And then we sit back and wonder why our schools have become hell on earth.

Young missionaries seeking to spread the light of the Lord by realizing that the way to the heart is through the stomach should be commended rather than punished for finding such an innovative way to stand against the impending darkness bent on engulfing our society.

## **Some British Heads Up Their Rears Over Hot Cross Buns**

According to Ken Ham in the September 2004 edition of the *Answers In Genesis* Newsletter, hot cross buns won’t be quite so cross anymore in merry ole England because a number of local governments there have banned them because the shape of the pastries offends Muslims and miscellaneous non-Christians.

Ham’s article does an excellent job explicating how such asinine policies are the result of an unbridled form of pluralism that goes beyond allowing different ideas to exist within one’s borders to actively undermining the foundations upon which Western civilization rests, thus allowing those alien beliefs the upper hand in determining how society is to be ultimately run.

If the politically correct are now going to get this jacked out of shape over the shape of a desert, maybe Christians should reciprocate the protest with one of our own by organizing a boycott of croissants. Croissants, you ask, the flaky moon-shaped pasteries?

That's right. Croissants are shaped like crescent moons, which are in turn the traditional symbol for Islam.

Such a boycott would show the multiculturalists and the Islamophants just how stupid this game really is.

The world over, radical Muslims are killing off Westerners and our allies left and right and the most important thing some limp-wristed tolerance monger can find to have a hissy fit about is some filthy heathen's hurt feelings. If this is the extent to which our civilization has declined, perhaps it deserves to be taken over or to fall into the rubbish bin of history.

### **British Radicals Flap Their Pie Holes Over Hot Cross Buns**

There is an old Chinese curse which damns the individual to live in interesting times. Those alive here at the beginning of the twenty-first century are living in such a period as they have been given a ringside seat to view the decline and eventual demise of the West.

As the spiritual backbone of the West, Christianity must be removed if there is to be any chance of conquering this once noble civilization. One way of accomplishing this objective is by shaming the general population into abandoning those celebrations commemorating important events in the history of Christendom such as Christmas and Easter.

Thus far, most of these efforts have been directed at Christmas. However, as these secularists hone and perfect their approach, they are beginning to set their sites on the even more pivotal celebration of Easter. For if one can divert attention from the Resurrection, there is little reason to pay much attention to Christ whatsoever.

In England, the Easter season is observed with hot cross buns, which consist of a bun with a cross of icing drawn across the top. A few years ago, a bit of a controversy broke out when a number of cities in Britain stopped serving the treats and some in the media dared to insinuate political correctness and hypertolerance might be the reasons for their removal from the menu.

However, liberals can no longer deny that those sympathetic to their outlook are engaged in this gastronomical censorship out of a sense of sensitivity run amok. For according to the *Suffolk Evening Star*, the head teacher of Oaks Primary School in Ipswich, England has asked that the crosses be removed from the pastry for fear of offending Jehovah's Witnesses attending the school.

Nice, isn't it, how everybody else's life has to come to a screeching halt? Now that the icing cross has been removed, would the school be willing to alter the recipe all together if some really whacked-out fundamentalist had a conniption fit about raisins being in the buns because of the inordinate number of New Age and Wiccan rituals that employ this dried fruit?

Probably not and rightfully so. If adherents of certain belief systems are going to get that worked up over what amounts to an innocent dessert, they should withdraw from the public school system altogether. Maybe if the Russellites spent more time on education instead of pestering people by ringing doorbells early Saturday mornings, they would have a viable alternative like other denominations have established

to protect their young people from what they perceive as the evils of the modern world.

The Watchtower operative interviewed about the school's decision responded, "Hot cross buns are a pagan symbol of fertility no different to bunnies, eggs, and Easter. The Bible states we should not worship things of a pagan origin." Unless they have been spiked with Viagra, these treats are not going to spark an orgy as they are only a piece of cake no matter what other connotations hot buns might bring to mind.

Perhaps regular visitors to Kingdom Halls should take the rest of the Bible as seriously as well and since they don't maybe that's the reason behind the aversion to this baked good. Remembrances of the Crucifixion and the Resurrection no doubt singe the consciences of those whose views of Jesus Christ are less than they really ought to be.

Those living in the decaying lands of the West should stop for a moment and think. If we are to give in so quickly to Jehovah's Witnesses who are not exactly known for fits of violence, how much more quickly will we surrender to cultists and similar fanatics who rampage as matter of sport when we do not submit to their heathen peculiarities?

## **Retail Humbug**

Wal-Mart is renowned as one of America's largest retail chains. The company earned this distinction in part by fostering a reputation based on traditional American values. However, in a manner similar to how the other institutions overseeing this nation have betrayed what this great country was originally based, this beloved weekend destination and rainy-day hangout has sold out to radical tolerance and diversity.

For retailers such as Wal-Mart, Christmas is really a joyous time since it is the time of year such establishments bring in the lion's share of their profits. You would think these merchants would not be ashamed to publicly acknowledge the celebration contributing so abundantly to their own prosperity. However, from the shame exhibited at the mention of the word "Christmas", you'd think the greeting was some lewd comment scrawled across a restroom stall.

Bill Donohue of the Catholic League for Religious and Civil Rights brought attention to this linguistic trend by launching a brief boycott against Wal-Mart for censoring recognition of the festive occasion by muting the traditional greeting of "Merry Christmas" to the more subdued "Happy Holidays". The boycott was originally started when it was discovered that searching "Christmas" on the Wal-Mart website returned "Holiday" results while Kwannza and Hanukah brought cybershoppers to results specific to these terms.

Insult was added to injury when the Catholic League learned of an email that essentially told Christians to sit down and shut up since the majority of the people in the world don't celebrate Christmas and most Christmas symbols have pagan origins anyway.

After considerable public embarrassment, Wal-Mart apologized for the snarky email and corrected its website so that a search for Christmas would take you to Christmas results. As such, the Catholic League called off the boycott since the group's concerns had been met.

However, one must question whether the boycott was called off too quickly since merely one symptom of a deeper underlying disease was addressed. For while the website takes surfers to the proper destination, it will take more than fiddling with some Internet programming code to cure an attitude prevalent

throughout the secular culture of executive America.

Wal-Mart plays the matter off by appearing to do the right thing and take a stand for traditional values. Yet upon closer examination, Wal-Mart has done very little in this regard.

Their website might now take unsuspecting shoppers to the correct page, but Wal-Mart corporate elites are still insisting that their wage slaves mutter the bland “Happy Holidays” rather than “Merry Christmas”. The justification for such yuletide speech codes is that, as a global corporation, they must appear to cater to the egos of all their customers.

Perhaps Wal-Mart should be reminded of where it was that Wal-Mart initially achieved the success it enjoys today. Even if Christmas is not celebrated in the distant lands where Wal-Mart hawks its wares, so what?

Here in America, the majority celebrate Christmas. If the immigrant swarms flooding across the border are offended by such a greeting extended in felicity and goodwill, they are always welcome to return to the trash-piles upon which they originally dwelt or to remain in lands of unbounded opportunity where women aren’t permitted to drive and where religious dissidents are decapitated.

Those claiming to be economic pragmatists contend that saying “Happy Holidays” simply makes good business sense as the phrase covers Christmas, Hanukah, and Kwanza and keeps everybody happy. But frankly though, are that many Jews even going to be caught in Wal-Mart and Kwanza is no more a real holiday than if a group of Star Wars fans got together to celebrate the destruction of the Death Star since events in that saga are dated in relation to the Battle of Yavin.

Despite all the hand wringing as to whether or not the mere utterance of “Christmas” will shatter Hebrew sensibilities that have endured far worse over the course of that culture’s turbulent history, it must be pointed out that those claiming to oppose public recognition of Christmas because of their adherence to Judaism are actually the members of that community that abide by the tenets of that faith the least and often only invoke the faith of their forefathers as a way to manipulate the guilt complex rampant throughout postmodern Western society.

The Jews that strive to live by Biblical values actually don’t have all that much of a problem if their fellow theists celebrate Christmas. Columnist Don Federer, an Orthodox Jew, is quoted in the November 2004 edition of Concerned Women Of America’s *Family Voice* as saying, “I’ve never been offended by anyone saying ‘Merry Christmas’ to me.”

Thus, liberal Jews do not oppose Christmas so much as an affront as to what they profess to be their faith. Rather they get all jacked out of shape because those Christians that celebrate the birth of Christ embrace the shared ethical heritage of these faiths that these closet secularists have abandoned.

In light of these linguistic policies, are we to forego vocalizing the names of other holidays other special interests might find offensive? Should we not refer to the Fourth of July amidst an act of commerce for fear of alienating closet royalists?

Seems Wal-Mart has no problem whatsoever recognizing other festivities that exclude significant percentages of the population. Utilizing this pronunciation paradigm, does that mean from now on Wal-Mart will refer to February as simply “History Month” rather than qualify it with a particular ethnic

classification?

Don't count on it as in the past, in league with Kraft Foods, the retail chain has distributed Black History booklets. What about a publication containing so-called "White" recipes; and if Wal-Mart's scope as a global company is to be its central marketing principle, how are over a billion Chinamen going to feel about such a document as I doubt there are that many brothers in the hood over there.

From as far back as most can remember, we have been told that the true meaning of Christmas goes far beyond the things beneath the tree that provide a sense of temporary joy. Perhaps the corporate world should also take the time to consider this lesson or they might not find as much green in their stockings in Christmases yet to come.

### **Holiday Tree, Holiday Tree, Thy Name's in Need of Serious Changing**

Not long ago across the United States, Americans looked forward to the Yuletide season as a time to spread goodwill and to take pride in the faith established by the Savior whose birthday is celebrated December 25th. Today, however, the day's name is seldom spoken in polite company and often replaced by euphemisms designed to placate the politically correct.

In December 1997, an announcement was made in the *Hyattsville Reporter*, that Maryland town's official newsletter, informing residents of the impending "holiday tree" lighting ceremony.

For the edification of all readers, the decoration involved is a Christmas tree since the only other holiday involving a tree is Arbor Day. Neither Hanukkah nor Kwanzaa involve ceremonies focusing upon trees.

Therefore, such finely-decorated holiday greenery should be referred to by its proper name --- as a Christmas tree. Those not celebrating Christmas need not revel in such a tree's presence.

Many will no doubt argue that it is not the place of civil government to promote any particular sectarian creed. But if that is the case, then why did that very same town newsletter advertise yoga classes to be held in the city's municipal building? One wonders if local authorities would be willing to permit and promote a Bible study held in the same facility.

Despite what people have been duped into believing, there is more to yoga than harmless bodily exercise. The activity is in fact a spiritual discipline steeped in Hindu and Eastern mysticism designed to open the individual to "higher forms of spiritual enlightenment"; in other words, to deceptions propagated by malevolent spiritual entities masquerading as angels of light. Us dumb Christian folk use to call them demons.

Sounds to me that holding a yoga class violates the First Amendment to a greater degree than simply calling a Christmas Tree a "Christmas tree".

Shakespeare might ask would a Christmas tree by any other name smell as sweet. Actually it wouldn't since it would no longer be a Christmas tree but instead an evergreen Trojan Horse designed to undermine the spiritual identity of the American people.

For while America is not a Christian nation in the sense that it has a national church to which citizens must pledge support under penalty of law, it is in the sense that all that is good about this country is

derived from the Judeo-Christian tradition. And to remove that tradition's celebrations will go a long way in destroying what is great about the USA.

### **More Things Change The More They Stay The Same In Leftist Suburb**

In some systems of Eastern thought, the doctrine of recurrence teaches that everything that has happened will happen again. Western philosophy of history drawing inspiration from a Biblical understanding of the universe does not share in the same exact idea since the Judeo-Christian worldview sees history as moving towards its ultimate conclusion in eternity. However, traditional orthodox theism admits there is nothing new under the sun, meaning all the schemes and frauds have all been around the block a few times and will continue to plague the human condition until the good Lord decides to step and put an end to all this nonsense.

In an essay in my underappreciated masterpiece "Yuletide Terror & Other Holiday Horrors", titled "Holiday Tree, Holiday Tree, Thy Name Is In Need Of Serious Changing" I examined the propriety of holding a yoga class in the City of Hyattsville municipal building since the practice is inherently spiritual and wondered if the same courtesy would be extended to a Christian group wanting to hold a prayer meeting or Bible study. For at the very same time the town fathers were opening city hall to limber swamis, these weeping willows of tolerance bent to the whims of political correctness switched the name of their Yuletide evergreen from that of "Christmas" to "Holiday" Tree. When published in the town newspaper, my comments were castigated by the course instructor, claiming yoga was merely physical exercise having nothing whatsoever to do with religion or faith. The more things change the more they stay the same and eventually both the yoga class and the trees name appeared in the local press again years later.

We are now well into the first decade of the new century and it seems some Christmas or I guess "holiday" traditions pretty much remain unchanged. Still a bastion of liberal foolishness to such an extent that many of the town's elites are ecstatic that the once quaint suburb has for the most part been overrun by immigrants barely speaking a lick of English and over massive revenue outlays going to finance a so-called "arts-district" where average taxpayers who actually work for a living will be forced to subsidize the lifestyles of decadent beatniks thinking they are too good to hold down regular jobs, it seems about the only form of expression that won't be supported is the utterance of the word "Christmas".

According to the 11/29/07 edition of the Gazette, Hyattsville was to hold its "holiday tree" lighting ceremony. Since the festival was also to include "holiday music", does that mean "Stars and Stripes Forever" was to be played as well since by definition the Fourth of July is a holiday as in such a leftist enclave such a blatantly pro-American celebration is probably as almost as despised as traditional Christian ones such as Christmas.

One might very well argue that the wording could have very well been an editorial; decision of the newspaper rather than that of the city. However, the 11/28/07 edition of the Hyattsville Reporter, the city's official newsletter, is rife with the spineless euphemism with the only mention of the word "Christmas" being justification why the office would be closed on December 25th.

In the middle of the first page of the newsletter, it reads, "Enjoy The Holiday Activity Edition". In the left hand column directly beneath this admonition is information regarding the "Sixth Annual Sonny Fraizer Holiday Toy Drive". On page 2, "Holiday Events" such as the tree lighting ceremony and "Breakfast



With Santa” (multiculturalist fans of the program “Futurama” may wonder why Kwanza Bot wasn’t invited) are listed.

As frustrating as this issue is in terms of undermining both traditional liberties and culture, perhaps of even greater concern over the long run is another spiritual danger that never really went away, namely the matter of yoga. Regarding my comments about yoga, the instructor dismissed them back in the late 90’s by claiming yoga was simply physical exercise with no spiritual ramifications.

By 2003, this very same individual was singing a different tune. In a Gazette article titled “Yoga Class Stretches Into Hyattsville” published on 10/16/03, the guru who years earlier claimed there was nothing inherently religious about yoga finally admitted, “If you want it, [yoga] could be a spiritual journey.”

From the website of this instructor’s own yoga studio, one sees that this is something of an understatement. Prominently listed on the website are the spiritual benefits of yoga which include “increased feelings of forgiveness, feelings of connection to the Divine, ability to empathize with others, and contentment.”

One might say those are the very same things the believer sees as the benefits bestowed upon the individual through devotion to prayer and Bible study. However, the admission as to the spiritual nature of yoga doesn’t stop there.

According to the website, Anusara Yoga is “a powerful hatha system that unifies a Tantric philosophy of intrinsic goodness with Universal Principles of Alignment, Anusara embodies an uplifting philosophy, epitomized by a celebration of the heart that looks for the good in all people and things.” Seems to me that’s about a lot more than limbering up the old backbone.

Furthermore, though all have sinned and fall short of the glory of God, is there all that much good in the likes of Adolf Hitler or Osama Bin Ladin to spend that much time looking for it and I doubt those that lost loved ones in the September 11th attacks would find much good in that tragedy either. Among the first things you learn in English 101 is to be careful about using the word “all”.

Of Kripalu Yoga, it says on the website, “It is a challenging approach to asana practice that emphasizes meditation and breathwork, encourages inward focus and spiritual attunement. Practicing Kripalu Yoga can initiate a gradual process of physical healing, psychological growth, and spiritual awakening.” Once again, things such as “spiritual attunement” and “psychological growth” are the benefits believers receive as byproducts of prayer focused upon the God of the universe as found in the person of His Son Jesus Christ.

Under the First Amendment, Americans are pretty much free to believe whatever they want. However, that fundamental operational principal of government and jurisprudence does not mean that those bent on subverting traditional principles should be allowed to have these foundations removed only to turn around and impose their own deceptive counterfeits.

### **Whose Holiday is it Anyway?**

Current history reveals that the centuries-long contest between Christianity and Islam for the heart of Western civilization continues despite the country’s pervasive secularism and maybe because of it.

This truth was evident when vandals defaced an Islamic star and crescent moon on display at the National Christmas Tree and Pageant of Peace in Washington, DC. However, the lines between the forces of tolerance and intolerance may not have been as clear cut as the mainstream media would have the public believe.

Muslim activists quickly labeled the desecration a hate crime most likely perpetrated by fundamentalist Christians. Never mind the fact that the swastika, the emblem used in this attack, is usually employed by Nazi and skinhead groups as antagonistic towards true Christianity as they are to the sociological subcategories more favored by the acolytes of affirmative action.

However, news regarding the expanse of Islam into the Washington Metropolitan area has not confined itself to these kinds of stories providing a sense of holiday drama.

Along with the news story highlighting reactions surrounding the attack were comments regarding the establishment of an Islamic academy in Loudoun County, Virginia.

High priests of tolerance were shown venting their outrage at an anonymous soul daring to distribute flyers warning that the school could possibly be used as a training center for terrorist activities. The broadcast correspondent narrating the piece went so far as to suggest that such intolerance must be rooted out and eliminated. Perhaps the reporter should be reminded that remarks against intolerance are intolerant themselves

Vandalism at the Pageant of Peace and National Christmas Tree should be punished as a crime against property since in reality there is nothing distinguishing crimes against property from crimes of bias since all crimes against natural law are motivated by hate. And while it might be a tad harsh to characterize an Islamic school as a terrorist training facility, it must be remembered that contemporary Islam is not exactly known for its widespread celebration of individual liberties.

For example, while feminists condemn Christian men for attending Promise Keeper rallies in hopes of becoming better husbands and fathers, Saudi Arabian women are forbidden from driving cars. Meanwhile, in this country as immigrant Muslims are blessed beyond measure by even being able to publicly express their faith as embodied by the crescent moon displayed on the Ellipse, Christians living in lands from which these immigrants came are severely persecuted.

In Saudi Arabia, government police regularly harass underground churches. In Kuwait --- the country whose freedom was purchased by U.S. soldiers denied the right to carry a Bible into situations from which it was questionable if they'd even return alive --- Muslims converting to Christianity face possible execution. And in Sudan, a regime endorsed by Nation of Islam leader Louis Farrakhan as a model African nation, Christian children are regularly sold into slavery for not belonging to the majority religion.

Furthermore, it is questionable whether an Islamic symbol even belongs at the National Christmas Tree in the first place. The Hanukkah menorah is allowed as a reminder of the intricate relationship shared between Christianity and Judaism in that Christianity is the fulfillment of the faith held dear by the Hebrew forefathers.

Where will this radical ecumenicalism end? Maybe we should put Mao's Little Red Book on display to placate the Communists or an inverted cross to appease the Satanists.

It is this kind of spiritual confusion that has allowed Islam to become one of the fastest growing religions in the country and the world today. For despite Islam's many errors, at least its followers possess the backbone to assert that some kind of truth exists. This is unlike many secularists and wishy-washy Christians who usually stand for nothing more than the satisfaction of their own sensual pleasures.

Though it may sound like fingers across a blackboard to the American Civil Liberties Union, America was founded upon Judeo-Christian ideals and our freedoms protecting the individual flow from this very system.

And while adherents of other faiths living in the United States deserve the same freedoms protecting all made in the image of God, the American people must be cautious in opening their traditional celebrations to those harboring alien beliefs, especially when those beliefs stand fast against what this great nation was founded upon in the first place.

### **Post-Christmas Wrap-Up**

Each year I write at least one column detailing the ongoing assault against Christmas throughout Western society. Usually this affront is led by a gaggle of secularists, liberals, and multiculturalists. However, there seems to be a festering opposition led by certain Christians to the Yuletide season. Even though these criticisms have not yet risen to the level of disruptive street theater engaged in by their unbelieving counterparts, they nevertheless reveal a somewhat dubious ecclesio-social philosophy.

The basic Christian anti-Christmas argument runs something like this: since the commemoration of Christmas is not explicitly commanded by Scripture, its celebration is therefore forbidden. Furthermore, since certain aspects of the holiday might be traceable to pagan origins, the committed Christian is obligated to have no parts of them.

Both assumptions miss the mark.

First, just because something is not explicitly commanded by revelation does not by default mean the practice in question is thus forbidden. For example, there's nothing in the Bible about automobiles either, but that does not make them evil in and of themselves regardless of what Al Gore might tell us.

Relatedly, just because Christmas might have been introduced as a Christian alternative to Saturnalia does not mean one commits idolatry by participating. America's own representative democracy draws initial inspiration impart from ancient Greece and Rome refined by Christian sensibilities. Does that mean the believer sins each and every time they step into a voting booth?

In both the case of the automobile and the exercise of suffrage, the propriety of each is determined by the intentions of the individual wielding them. The same is true of Christmas.

Fundamentalist John R. Rice writes in *Why I Love Christmas*, "Why should any Christian be grieved if I especially think about the birth of Christ on December 25? Why should anybody grieve if I sing Christmas carols, if I have a celebration...? Do you think you would honor God more by having less Scripture, less song, less spirit of giving, less ... love for others?"

Seems Scripture bears out this perspective. Romans 14:5-6 reads, "One man regards one day above another, another regards everyday alike. Let each man be fully convinced in his own mind. He who

observes the day, observes it for the Lord, for he gives thanks to God; and he who eats not, for the Lord, he does not eat, and gives thanks to God (NASB).”

So if you want to sit around as a humbug, that’s your business under the auspicious banner of Christian liberty. Just don’t require the rest of us to join in on your pity party.

Like all other good things in life, Christmas has no doubt been abused. But just because some churches treat their members like crud does not mean Sunday services ought to be prohibited everywhere else; even though some husbands and wives fight like cats and dogs that does not justify the abolition of marriage. Why not apply the same judicious spirit to Christmas as well?

As intense as this debate over a secondary issue may be, in a way the dispute simply manifests an erroneous approach to affairs portending repercussions more ominous than whether we ought hang the tinsel or string the lights this year. The underlying attitude enunciated by those opposed to the celebration of Christmas puts our very rights as free men at stake.

The major thrust of two Christmas columns in particular --- “Tis the Season (For Double Standards)” and “Termination Claus” --- focused upon the threat to individual liberties and America’s national culture posed by the anti-yuletide pogrom rampaging in locations across the United States. Much to my surprise, a significant number of responses from within the Christian community criticized the commentaries in question for daring to raise concerns regarding current events and social policy in the first place.

A number display a disturbing “so what” attitude or exhibit an appalling level of stupidity pertaining to the nature and operation of American sociopolitical institutions.

Regarding plans by the New York City public school system to open special prayer rooms for Muslims celebrating Ramadan while denying similar ecclesiastical concessions to Christian students, one response suggested this policy was wholly appropriate since Matthew 6:5-7 urges the Christian to earnestly pray in private rather than create a public spectacle. While this may be the theologically correct fashion through which to petition the Almighty, the reader’s interpretation of the situation misses the point in that it’s not the government’s place to proscribe the proper ritual form for my prayers to take or to limit me from making a religious buffoon of myself. The issue at stake centers around the exercise of our rights as individuals.

Unfortunately, this is a matter this variety of Christian approaches in a lackadaisical fashion. Some responded to the concerns raised regarding the diminution of America’s religious liberties with what amounted to a dismissive metaphorical yawn, noting that the Bible makes clear that persecution will ultimately befall those daring to stand for Christ’s name.

Maybe so, but here in the United States, God in His grace, acting through the wisdom of the Founding Fathers, permitted the establishment of limited and correctable participatory political institutions allowing an engaged citizenry to hold the horrors of tyranny at bay.

Granted, the Bible warns conditions will wax worse and worse as this age continues to wind down. But do these students of prophecy ever stop and think such a decayed situation will be the result of Christians shirking their civic duty as salt and light?

It’s unlikely these misguided souls longing for persecution to come upon them even know what that

means or what it will entail. One critic expressed satisfaction in himself for avoiding contact with the media, even the Christian and conservative alternatives. One wonders how these Christians are capable of emulating the children of Issachar, who were commended in I Chronicles 12:32 for understanding the times, if they don't even scour available news sources for intelligence of events unfolding around them in the world today.

Some Christians throw a hissy fit if their employer requires them to work Sundays. Do they really think they could muster the courage to withstand more strident forms of opposition like those befalling believers in Sudan such as slavery, mutilation, and even murder?

Isn't it in our best interests as a free people to delay these hardships as long as possible or by doing what's within the realm of legitimacy to mitigate the impact of these pending atrocities? After all, did not the Apostle Paul appeal to the authorities in Rome to ensure adherence to proper judicial procedure?

This call for civic noninvolvement exposes a profound failure in comprehending the way in which God set up human society and equipped individuals in unique ways to fulfill roles essential to its effective administration.

One reader responded, "I don't think we were ever instructed in Scripture to change society by involvement in politics. By fulfilling the great commission we are doing the will of the Lord Jesus Christ."

Christ did tell us that His kingdom is not of this world. As such, Christians must realize that under the current world situation mankind will never enjoy heaven on earth. However, that does not mean we are to role over and hand the whole show over to those fomenting the reprobate values that will drag the quality of our culture and standard of living down with them. After all, Luke 19:13 tells us, "Occupy till I come."

To limit the purpose of the Great Commission to simply making converts inappropriately curtails the impact of this divinely appointed task upon the world. A disciple is one who construes all of reality through the mold of a particular school of thought or belief. Conservative Presbyterians have been better overall, thank God, at realizing this than some of their Baptist or Nondenominational counterparts.

It must be pointed out that not everyone is called to be a pastor, evangelist, or missionary. So what if your talents lie elsewhere? Too bad. Your to keep your mouth shut and the contributions pouring into the collection plate according to the proponents of cultural disengagement.

But does not the beloved King James Version those espousing this line of argumentation love to flaunt as if the text provides justification lacking in other translations note in I Corinthians 12:28 that God has specifically given the gift of government to some?

Romans 13:4 tells us, "For he [the ruler] is the minister of God." Who better than to administer the reins of government than someone who believes in the God who has allowed them to come to a position of authority? After all, we have seen the confusion unbelieving pastors have wrought in mainline denominations. Just think how much worse it will be when apostates hold sway over life and death.

Cal Thomas once noted no one is called to part time Christian service, with the need for believers trained in government, journalism, and mass communication as great --- if not more so --- than those schooled in more traditional approaches to missions and related theological vocations.

God must have thought it important to include as part of the Biblical record the events surrounding the birth of His Son Jesus Christ. Certainly even the stodgiest, legalistic Scrooge can find something to celebrate about God entering the world in human form to show us His love and to take upon Himself the penalty for our own sin. Any Christian who cannot does not have a problem so much with a particular holiday per say as they may with God Himself.

### **It's The Great Halloween Debate, Charlie Brown**

In this age of information, wisdom and true knowledge are sorely lacking. This is particularly evident in reference to the controversies surrounding various holidays such as Halloween. Careful reflection reveals that many positions on either side regarding this autumnal celebration are found wanting.

Often liberals are correct in pointing out the hysteria that often results from Christians opposed to Halloween. After all, contrary to what some ministries argue, one is seldom sucked into Satanism through the guise of Trick-or-Treating.

However, these liberals are incorrect in their assertion that Wicca --- the belief system often characterized by witchcraft --- is a harmless form of ancient knowledge steeped in nature and magical lore.

It is in fact a religion bent on undermining Judeo-Christian values by annihilating the distinction between the creation and the Creator. This is attempted through the philosophy of pantheism, the idea that the universe as a totality is what we know as God. Even the most fundamentalist of Christians knows this has scant little bearing upon Trick-or-Treating as currently practiced.

One is forced to wonder, however, if these same forces of holiday fun are going to speak out against the agnostic party-poopers who annually embark on their campaign to remove the last vestiges of Christmas from American culture.

For better or worse, one of the primary reasons certain Christian parents have mobilized against Halloween in schools is because of the campaign to remove the Yuletide celebration of Christ's birth from the educational calendar. They figure if they cannot recognize their own sacred celebrations, then why should they recognize those of contending faiths. If we cannot pray openly to the God of heaven, then why should our kids be exposed to forms of meditation and ouja boards honoring the demons of hell?

Many of the supposedly sophisticated assert that Satan is not the mastermind behind the chaos plaguing mankind. But who else could be wily enough to deceive us into outlawing the only thing that can solve our problems (the message of Jesus Christ) while distracting those that do possess the answer into believing that the worst thing out there in the fall of the year is an innocent tradition where kids get dressed up in costumes in search of candy?

### **Response Of Christian Parents To Trick-Or-Treat A Halloween Mystery**

I find it interesting that contemporary Christian parents that revel in all the fun they had trick-or-treating as kids forbid their offspring from doing the same.

Even Russell Moore of the Southern Baptist Seminary admitted on *The Albert Mohler Program* that Halloween was his favorite holiday as a youth but yet refuses to allow his children to participate.

I also found it interesting that these Christian radio hosts condemning participation commemorate the day with its cutesy anthems such as the theme from the Adam's Family and "I Told The Witch Doctor" by Alvin and the Chipmunks and "Tubular Bells" from the Exorcist.

I rather enjoy such classic tunes, but I am not the one out calling down condemnation over this celebration when participants aren't out wallowing in the more gory aspects of the day.

Kind of reminds me of those parents in the Josh Harris *I Kissed Dating Goodbye* crowd who themselves dated but think their oversight of their children is so complete that the son or daughter is to not fall in love or experience feelings any kind of feelings towards the opposite sex until the parents grant permission.

And yet unlike parents that have gone astray and want to prevent their children from pursuing errant ways such as substance abuse or promiscuity, former "weeners" often speak of their exploits with a nostalgic glee that will only compound the left-out feeling of their progeny.

If these parents did not become Satanists or ax murderers but fear their own children will, doesn't this speak more to their own lack of skill in raising a family than anything inherently wrong to this annual nocturnal celebration?

### **Much "Aboo" About Nothing**

Often the sincere piety and religious devotion of Southerners is worthy of admiration, but methinks too much stink is being made down south about Halloween falling on a Sunday.

On the one hand you have spook-day purists insisting what an affront it would be to move the celebration back to Saturday evening, which has often been the tradition when Halloween fell on a Sunday.

However, even those wanting the festival moved back to the 30th are enough to strain my sympathies for my fellow coreligionists.

Contrary to the tone of the Christians interviewed in an Associated Press article, the Seals of the Apocalypse are not going to be broken just because a few kids go Trick-Or-Treating on a Sunday evening.

One distraught woman over exaggerated in the story, "You just don't do it on Sunday. That's Christ's day. You go to church on Sunday, you don't go out and celebrate the devil. That'll confuse a child."

Lady, you are not in church all day long. Bet these same hayseeds making such a big deal about the "Sabbath", which is technically Saturday anyway, don't have much of a problem going to Wal-Mart or watching football on the day under consideration here.

If your kid is thrown off the straight and narrow that easily, you have more serious problems on your hands. As Gretchin Passantino of Answers In Action said on a recent *Bible Answer Man* broadcast tackling the Halloween controversy, Trick-Or-Treating won't make you a Satanist anymore than opening a Christmas present makes you a Christian. Like many other of life's activities, this one merely takes on the meaning we put into it.

The article detailing the Saturday vs. Sunday dispute went on to offer a very pro-market solution that allows everyone to win without having to call upon government for a solution. Those who want to, can go

out on Saturday night. Those who prefer Sunday, can go out on Sunday. And to those enterprising young capitalists who don't have a preference, they can easily go out on both.

## **Conditions of Disrepair Pervade Washington DC Area Cemetery**

In going on to his eternal reward, the last profundity Pope John Paul II conveyed to the world was that, no matter how good we might be as individuals, death will eventually come to embrace us all. And as we all stop for a moment to ponder our earthly demises, it is only natural to consider the ultimate disposition of our physical remains. But whereas those of the Pope's will always be properly honored as befitting someone of his stature, often the remainder of us don't get even the minimal respect we deserve as human beings having once walked this earth as creatures made in the image of God.

My family went to the Fort Lincoln Cemetery in suburban Maryland on Easter Sunday to pay respects to my mother's brother interned there. It would be an understatement to say we were in for an "Easter surprise" we would never forget.

Traditionally, cemeteries are noted for their meticulous upkeep in order to facilitate reflection and put the visitor's mind at ease. However, from the conditions prevailing at this memorial garden, one would be safe to say local junkyards, garbage dumps, and sewage treatment plants receive more conscientious care.

We were first unsettled by the unsightly mud tracks left behind from the grass being torn up from having been driven over by a heavy piece of equipment. However, the extent of the damage went much further.

Grave markers were bent, indicating they had been carelessly run over by the same mechanical behemoth that had trod the grass asunder. Some memorial plaques were torn out of the ground and a number of headstones knocked over. Vases were either damaged and or missing from their respective sites. Other graves were obstructed by caked on mud, obscuring the record of their occupants ever having walked the earth.

This damage was not confined to one block of the premises but was rather endemic throughout the property. Do cemetery administrators plan to contact the families of those whose graves they have defiled, apologize for their shoddy workmanship, and make repairs or restitution as the honorable would? Or are the gambling their transgressions will go unnoticed since cemetery visitation is itself a dying tradition with the upcoming generation preferring those gaudy roadside cross displays and stuffed animal shrines.

Though the souls of the departed resting at this site do not reside there, their resting places should be respected just the same. This cemetery is named after the 16th President of the United States. His spirit does not reside at the memorial erected a few short miles away in Washington , D.C. in his honor, but the structure is respected nonetheless. If death is the great equalizer, ought not the resting places of each person be treated with the same dignity?

## **Why Then Celebrate?**

Americans honor the Fourth of July to commemorate the document that spelled-out our rights to the world at large and to remember the conflict that helped make those rights a viable political reality. However, to some, those values and sentiments embodied by this civic celebration should be shunned when they do not conform to prevailing liberal sensibilities.



The media in the United States exists under the protections of the First Amendment to propagate speech unfettered by government control. But what mechanism exists to protect those whose speech has been stifled by the media?

Two country musicians have been forced to contemplate the above quandary in light of the response to their respective songs relating the events of September 11th to America's historical consciousness. Both artists have been censored for similar reasons.

The first to fall from the favor of media elites was Toby Keith. Keith was to have sung his song "Courtesy of the Red, White, and Blue (The Angry American)" for ABC's Fourth of July special to be hosted by Peter Jennings. Likewise, Charlie Daniels was to have sung his "The Last Fallen Hero" on "The Capitol Fourth" to be broadcast on PBS. Both musicians were told their songs were inappropriate for the national venues in which they hoped to perform.

Of Toby Keith's song, the Associated Press was told, "This show is meant to be a celebration of America's strength and diversity. By his own definition, it's an angry song, and that's not what our producers wanted to open the celebration with." Basically, say what you want so long as you agree with our placid internationalism where all points of view are equal and no culture better than any other. Seems there's not much diversity to go around when we are compelled to display a uniformity of opinion.

There is something else at work here since both Keith's and Daniels' songs embody the American strength and character both of these concerts claim to highlight. Keith's song declares, "Justice will be served and the battle will rage. This big dog will fight when you rattle his cage. And you will be sorry you messed with the U.S. of A."

What other country would be strong enough to carry out such a promise after a potentially debilitating attack? Certainly not the sissy nations of Europe so mired in cultural relativism and political correctness that they'd probably thank the terrorists for the attack or open their borders even wider to the flood of immigration.

Daniels' song, "The Last Fallen Hero", is a more reflective piece recognizing the sacrifice of those lost in the September attacks and the precarious point in history at which the nation now stands. The intent of his song is epitomized by the stanza expressing the following: "Oh the winds of war are blowing and there's no way of knowing where this bloody path we're traveling will lead. But we must follow to the end or face it all again."

Yet apparently such profundity has very little to do with the real meaning of Independence Day according to the liberal media mindset. Regarding these kinds of songs, the producers of ABC's extravaganza told the Associated Press that's not what they wanted their show to be about.

A number of the Founding Fathers always intended the Fourth of July to be a joyous occasion. However, I don't think they had scantily-clad dancing girls adorned in American-flag bikinis prancing around on stage with Barry Bostwick in front of the Capitol in mind when it came to celebrating this particular holiday as depicted in film footage from previous years. Since these Forefathers pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor for the sake of this great nation, I doubt they would object to us taking part of this sanctified day under consideration in which we, as their descendents, now find ourselves in a conflict --- not that unlike the one they found themselves in so long ago --- to memorialize those paying the highest price possible for the freedom of our country.

Toby Keith contends that Peter Jennings argued that a song with the lyrical content in question did not belong on his network. While some might object to the mild expletive mentioned in Keith's ballad, it is actually sedate compared to much of the bilge on TV and I can assure you its omission had nothing to do with moral concerns.

Jennings' network is, after all, the one that bequeathed America such edifying television fare as *NYPD Blue*, the raucous police drama renowned for its raunchy language and for broadcasting the bare backsides of its lead thespians. If ABC only broadcasts those programming elements with which it agrees 100%, decent Americans ought to wake up and wonder at just what values (or lack thereof) are being embraced by these media apparatchiks and seriously ponder whether these reprobates should be allowed to continue their stewardship of the public airwaves.

Sometimes one is forced to stop and figure out just whose side the media is really on. With the exception of Fox News, after all, many of those affiliated with these various journalistic organizations went to great lengths in justifying as to why being associated with the American flag was beneath them as an unacceptable breach in their highly-vaunted but over-inflated sense of objectivity. In the soapbox section of his webpage, Charlie Daniels lamented, "I truly don't understand the actions of PBS, the network which espouses the causes of some pretty far out characters in the name of free speech."

And as Americans appreciate their heritage of freedom and take stock on this special day of where our country finds itself in relation to the tangled web of despotic nations and nihilistic revolutionaries attempting to snuff out freedom for all mankind, they would do well to consider the so-called cultured despisers of liberty who would rend asunder our preeminence in the world just assuredly as any diaper-headed terrorist but in simply a far more subtle and thus possibly far more seditious manner.

### **Firecracker Of A Debate**

Most columns --- though no doubt read --- do not usually generate enough response worthy of additional comment. One exception though tends to be those addressing the debates that have arisen surrounding national holidays as American culture grows increasingly fractious and divided.

With the controversy surrounding prominent Independence Day concerts, my commentary addressing this particular holiday was no exception. Much like the media professionals depicted on either side of this public dispute, those entering the dialogue at the level of Internet discussion found themselves considering the relationship between free speech, acceptable rhetoric, and the appropriate degree of control to be exercised by those in positions of power in determining the content of these celebratory performances.

Part of the criticism surrounding "Courtesy of the Red, White, and Blue (The Angry American)" and "The Last Fallen Hero" dealt with minor aesthetic differences. One reader fretted that these songs ought to be prohibited at the concerts for their potential lack of politeness and possible vulgarity. The last I checked, flying jetliners into office buildings wasn't too polite and, one might argue, downright vulgar.

This reader continued, "If you are vulgar and profane, are you not a liberal?" In light of the heaving cleavage, extramarital frolicking and the number of feminine hygiene products broadcast almost nightly, Toby's sentiments can hardly be considered profane.

Keith's song simply expresses what every patriotic American would like to do to this terrorist scum.

Frankly, anyone who did not feel this way is either in some kind of mental la-la land or lying about the matter. What makes our country superior to our enemies from the backwards nations of the earth is that most Americans retain the self-control needed to keep these impulses confined to the realm of emotional desire whereas the uncivilized like the Palestinian mobs cave in to the desire to rampage and pillage almost everyday before breakfast it seems.

The deeper matters addressed by the responses go beyond the mere artistic differences of linguistic aesthetics. Instead they rise to concerns of control and expression in the context of media relationships.

One can argue all they want that ABC had the right to deny Toby Keith the opportunity to participate in that network's Fourth of July celebration since, as one reader wrote, "Censorship is when people are not permitted to express themselves. When the person paying the bills for an event decides not to chose you or your song that is not censorship." That is why the actions taken against Charlie Daniels and his song "The Last Fallen Hero" are a different matter entirely.

It has been jokingly said that the freedom of the press amounts to little more than he who owns the press has the freedom or at least those paying for it do. For the most part that is okay provided their resources are used to actually propagate speech rather than erect artificial barriers hindering alternative forms of media as embodied by the decision requiring audio websites to pay fees not extracted from traditional radio stations.

It is under the banner of free market economics and the rule of the dollar that Charlie Daniels is able to make statements against the actions taken against his song. It must be remembered that PBS is hardly a self-supporting outfit, despite the untold billions raked in by Barney and Big Bird.

Had "A Capitol Fourth" been financed by revenue generated from this kind of ancillary marketing or by donations from those gullible enough to send in contributions for those cheesy tote-bags as the event should have been, these critics might have had a case in labeling Daniels' comments as an example of the "moral flabbiness" a part of the entitlement mentality. However, a quick glance at the PBS Capitol Fourth website quickly deflates this argument.

"The Capitol Fourth", it turns out, is not financed solely by some psudeo-philanthropist such as Ted Turner. Among the events sponsors rank the National Park Service, the National Endowment for the Arts, the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, and the U.S. Army, government agencies everyone (and the last time I checked) paid for by the good taxpaying citizens of the United States.

Thus in a sense, one could say Charlie Daniels was indeed a benefactor of this event. Therefore, he was well within his rights in sharing his perspective regarding the compositional selections commemorating the holiday.

After all, PBS had asked him to take part and unceremoniously rescinded the invitation when the network failed to find the courage necessary to take a stand for America and for those who fell victim to multiculturalism run amok in the September attacks. Wouldn't want to alienate donations from terrorist-friendly nations such as Saudi Arabia now would we? Would Ossie Davis be told to sit down and keep quiet if he had planned to drone on about the inequities of slavery and segregation for the umpteenth-thousand time? Makes you wonder just whose side these producers are really on.

But there is more at stake here than balladary brinkmanship. The attitudes expressed by the critics of the

original commentary possess startling ramifications in responding that Charlie Daniels had no grounds to complain about the slight against him. Their position is essentially that when we don't like something or feel a media production violates our values we are to sit there with our mouths shut in deference to our supposed creative betters in the ranks of the cultural elite.

Apparently these critics have forgotten that in a free society both economic and political change are brought about by those courageous enough to speak their minds. Both Toby Keith and Charlie Daniels don't seem as selfish when we realize they were standing up for the values and beliefs embraced by the vast majority of Americans condescendingly looked down upon by these cultural snobs.

But unlike the radicals adored by the likes of the PBS crowd, neither Toby Keith nor Charlie Daniels created a disturbance infringing upon the rights of others to enjoy these respective concerts ( as bland as they might have been ) or destroyed various forms of public or private property in the name of raising consciousness. All either did was vocalize their thoughts in the hopes of correcting the situation. Apparently the Fourth of July is not the only quintessentially American institution these elitists have failed to comprehend.

### **O' How I Hate a Parade**

Citizens bear the burden of taxation knowing this financial sacrifice helps make various government services available. However, residents of College Park, Maryland might not feel so grateful during the season of Thanksgiving upon learning how their municipal council decided to commemorate the occasion.

The University of Maryland's marching band, The Mighty Sound of Maryland, received the honor of being selected as one of the bands to be featured in the 2000 Macy's Thanksgiving Day Parade. Such honors don't come cheap. The band required \$120,000 to defray the cost of the trip.

The band did not necessarily raise money through bake sales and carwashes. According to the campus newspaper, the *Diamondback*, funds were provided by several sources, the most controversial being a \$5,000 donation authorized by the College Park City Council.

In light of the Thanksgiving and Christmas seasons, it can be difficult to oppose acts of foolhardiness undertaken in the name of holiday eleemosynary. Thankfully, courageous souls and logical minds arose to speak out against this measure passing with a margin of 6 to 1.

One such voice spoke out saying in the campus paper, "I'd like to support the band as much as anybody, but as taxpayers the money comes out of our pockets."

That is something otherwise forgotten in anticipation of these kinds of festivities. It is quite easy to overstep the delineated bounds of authority and lines of propriety with someone else's money. And this is not a disorder confined solely to the College Park City Council.

Each year in nearby Hyattsville, the city council authorizes a contribution to the local Festival of Lights held at Watkins Regional Park in Largo, Maryland. It is considerably less than the donation proffered by College Park to the University of Maryland Band; but frankly it is not Hyattsville's to give as that money was collected through mandatory taxation to pay for essential city functions, not to make Rudolph's nose glow so bright.

Nor is the private sector immune either, deciding to engage in this brand of frivolity instead of maximizing their services for their real customers.

The University newspaper pointed out that Chevy Chase Bank also donated \$1,000 to be put towards the band's Macy's trip. Maybe if financial institutions concentrated on making money instead of doling it out to every pathetic cause that comes along with an outstretched hand, banks could possibly offer average account holders interest rates higher than the current pitiful levels.

The same could also be said of grocery chains participating in local food drives. Maybe if they cut prices instead of donating goods to charitable pantries, not as many people would need access to this kind of social service.

Also of issue is the haughtiness of those supporting the donation. Like a welfare recipient defending their handout, the *Diamondback* editorial page castigated those daring to question the propriety of this legislative charity.

The editorial sneered, "The College Park Council finally gave the campus something other than a headache." Well what exactly has the university given the citizens of College Park other than documented cases of drunken fraternity members relieving themselves in the yards of residents?

The lone councilman with the foresight to oppose the donation said, "If one of the choruses gets an invitation from Vienna to come and sing, are we going to airlift the sopranos?" He also noted that the city does not financially support trips by scout troops, schools, or other organizations.

Either all of these groups receive their share of the municipal trough or no one should receive one cent.

The university paper concluded, "Those who think the money should not be given because it comes out of taxpayers' pockets should get over themselves. Their tax dollars could be going to a lesser cause than sending the Mighty Sound of Maryland to the biggest turkey feast of the year."

Maybe certain elements at the University of Maryland ought to get over themselves and not be so full of hubris that they somehow think their own sense of pride and accomplishment is equal with the municipal interests of the City of College Park.

Governments on all levels could indeed spend tax revenue on a much higher cause, namely those functions delineated in founding documents, town charters, and legal statutes describing those tasks essential for smooth civic administration --- not on causes where the funds are best generated by those directly deriving the enjoyment or benefit of said activities.

If governing bodies seem to have excess cash to toss around carelessly, it ought to be returned to the taxpayer or invested in such a manner as to reduce future tax burdens. And retaining more of our own income is something we could all be thankful for throughout the entire year.

### **Should Holiday Cheer Be Required?**

In the eyes of certain elites, it seems Christmas has become yet one more occasion to point out that average Americans can't do anything right.

Over the past several years, Americans have grown accustomed to numerous media accounts of overly zealous government officials and fanatical ACLU attorneys undermining the most fundamental constitutional liberties regarding the freedom of religious expression in an effort to snuff out various Christmas celebrations. One school even went so far as to forbid its students from mentioning the vulgar Yuletide c-word.

But now it seems the proverbial pendulum may be swinging the other way in the form of mandatory participation even if the holiday's religious significance has been removed.

At the University of Maryland, students in one communication class were compelled to participate in a toy drive where each student was required to donate five new toys (secondhand ones not being good enough) as part of the requirements for the course.

Though the project benefited patients at Children's Hospital, that is not the point. Students go to college to write papers and take examinations, not to assuage some professor's panging social conscience. One can imagine the controversy that would erupt had a professor required students to distribute Gospel tracts on a street corner.

This idea of mandatory voluntarism --- the biggest oxymoron since "government efficiency" --- is becoming the trend the whole year through as embodied by Maryland's community service graduation requirement.

These notions have become so widespread that even some conservative public policy organizations once standing for the rights of the individual have caved in on this issue. Instead of providing students with ways to combat the requirements or with tips on how to slide by with minimal effort, one organization's newsletter broke out in an essay why such service was worthwhile and suggested ways in which to fulfill this unconstitutional form of involuntary servitude.

There is nothing wrong in volunteering. In fact, volunteering came to be seen as a laudable activity since at one time there was nothing beyond one's own conscience compelling the individual to engage in such acts of eleemosynary.

But now the idea of charity is used to beat the average person over the head by arguing it is no longer enough to mind one's own business by staying to one's self and tending the needs of one's own family. Yet if each of us met this bare minimum, most charities would not need to exist.

So maybe it is time we put the onus on those requiring the services of these organizations rather than on those of us providing the base of financial support allowing those running these outfits to pull down fat salaries and posh expense accounts.

As each of us ponders the true meaning of the Christmas season, we must ultimately realize that our relation to the Prince of Peace and the Lord of Lords is a profoundly individual one that we can only make ourselves. No one --- not even government --- can make it for us.

We can either celebrate the true meaning of the day or stick our fingers in our ears to ignore it. Either way, it is none of the government's concern. It is none of Uncle Sam's business if I choose to be a Scrooge. The old miser's heart was, after all, changed by the gentle cajoling of three spirits and not by the strong-arm tactics of three socially meddling bureaucrats.

## **Merry Bizaromass**

In the Superman comics, Bizarro is a twisted clone of Superman that perceives things backwards such as bad being good, up being down, and left being right. As intense as the annual Christmas conflagrations have become over the past few years, it was only a matter of time before those wishing to stand for decency and common sense found themselves in an unsettling situation where the usual roles were reversed.

In a number of short stories I have written such as “The Schauungtown Chronicles” and “An U.N.I.Q.U.E. Individual”, an organization known as the Toleration Fellowship set in a world governed by an elaborate system of homeowner associations suppresses traditional religious expression on behalf of secularists and New Age mystics in the name of inclusion and diversity. The Toleration Fellowship uses as its insignia the upside-down broken-cross peace symbol.

In a case in Colorado, it seems these roles have been reversed. A woman in a homeowner association there was being threatened with a fine of \$25 a day for hanging on her home on private property a wreath in the shape of the peace sign. A number of residents took offense because the peace sign can also be interpreted as a Satanic symbol celebrating the defeat of Christ.

And even though the connections between New Age peaceniks and Luciferians are not exposed as nearly as much as they ought to be, so what in regards to what this lady wants to hang on the side of her house? It's not like she tried to hang this on the side of someone else's house or painted a naked lady tied to an altar. It's just a round wreath not that much different than anybody else's.

This is America and private property should still mean something. However, if we dig below the surface of this story that tickles our Christmas cackles we will see a much more ominous threat here than even whether or not a beloved Christmas decoration conforms to acceptable standards and that issue is about out of control homeowner associations.

Those in the “all rules must be obeyed simply because they are rules even if they say toss your granny into oncoming traffic” crowd will argue that membership in these organizations is voluntary. Is it though?

For if the individual wants to live in a particular neighborhood, they are informed almost as an after thought in many cases once the real estate transaction is completed that they must render homage as a vassal unto his feudal lord if they desire to remain in their newly procured domicile. And like any other serf living on a manor, the member of the homeowner association is bound by a pledge of obedience to whatever rules and bylaws the peasant's betters might decide to promulgate.

Those enthusiastic to have every detail of their lives micromanaged down to the smallest degree that, if these kinds of rules are not enforced, the order and aesthetics making these developments desirable places to dwell will not be maintained. However, from analyzing just how extensive these kinds of regulations have become over the years, one has to ask are these governing boards more concerned about maintaining order or imposing a uniformity of thought upon the residents.

For what harm can a wreath with a couple extra sprigs of greenery strategically placed cause to property values. However, to the totalist mind such a decoration poses a greater threat to the COMMUNITY than a rusted car up on four cement blocks with rats living in it.

In several press accounts, it was initially reported that a decoration interpreted as being against the war could not be countenanced since it might foment DIVISIVENESS, one of the few remaining offenses worse than INDIVIDUALISM with the only greater wrongs perhaps being “racism” or “homophobia”.

Thus, conformity to the group norm even in matters not even related to decorum or safety become even more important than liberties once considered foundational such as free expression and conscience. Specifics of the Second Gulf War asides, funny, I thought those qualities were some of the primary reasons justifying intervention abroad.

So long as no one goes to slashing tires and stuffing dead cats into mail boxes, what’s wrong with a little neighborhood division as it will actually prove good for everyone in the long run. It is in areas where everyone is forced to swallow the expression of their convictions for fear of incurring some kind of legal penalty or social sanction as authorized under speech codes against “hate speech” and the like that such violence and vandalism usually occur.

Eventually, the homeowners association backed down from taking action against the peace sign. Ironically, that is itself a disturbing sign from a certain perspective.

For the governing board did not ultimately back down from its position having realized they had infringed upon the property rights and the dignity of the individual homeowner but rather because of the intensity of the response to their initial decision. Thus, things are not determined to be right or wrong by their relation to some eternal unchanging standard but whether or not they conform to the group consensus. Or as my family, who even though they don’t live in a homeowners association, were informed by a neighbor with whom we had gotten into a verbal altercation that they did not have to respect our property because, “No one likes you all anyway.”

This year, the unorthodox Yuletide decoration will be allowed to remain. But what is to protect its hanger when public opinion turns; does it really then become wrong to hang whatever greenery one wants on the side of their domicile?

Apart from the salvation found only in His Son Jesus Christ, God’s greatest gift to humanity is none other than the freedom we enjoy as beings created in His image. Thus one of the most profound yet subtle forms of blasphemy is none other than handing this precious heritage over to either individuals or organizations that were never meant to exert control to such an extent over our lives.

### **Use Season to Celebrate Self-Sufficiency**

The Christmas season use to be a time when individuals would reflect upon the deepest eternal truths such as the love of God and His Incarnation in the person of His Son Jesus Christ. Now it has degenerated into just another occasion to denigrate average Americans minding their own business and earning a living on their own.

This is particularly evident in regards to efforts designed to allegedly assist the supposedly “underprivileged” who in reality get more attention than the rest of us. Rather than providing a way whereby self-reliance might be thrust upon all Americans, such efforts are usually designed to shame the self-sufficient and to accumulate power for those directing these efforts at social manipulation.

One television station conducting a food drive in league with an area grocery chain employed this kind of



strategy against customers daring to provide provisions for their own families.

One reporter asked a mother if she thought it was important for her child to eat nutritious food. When the mother responded in the affirmative, the reporter indignantly inquired if the mother had given any thought to the indigent throughout the Washington Metropolitan Area. Some bold soul should have asked why should we.

Such vehement lines of questioning would be better directed towards other sources. For example, perhaps we should ask why such people are homeless or why they decide to procreate when they clearly cannot provide for their offspring. One might discover that the fault more often lies with the destitute rather than those of us minding our own business.

Another tactic employed in the holiday season between Thanksgiving and Christmas centers around on how we ought to “give back to the community”.

Unless one is employed in a totally useless occupation such as thespianism, one “gives back” to the community every day one goes to work. Though they are not as glamorous careers as broadcast journalism or homeless advocacy, just sit back and see how long society stands without the farmer to grow the food or the supermarket clerk to stock it on the shelves. There’d be no community to give back to.

Perhaps it is time this fancy platitude was turned on those invoking it. One wonders just how many television reporters contribute to the elimination of malnutrition when the cameras aren’t there to videotape their efforts.

While the Bible instructs us to help the poor, it also says if you don’t work, you don’t eat. Many of the poor are poor because they decide not to work. Despite the arguments of the school lunch lobby, one does not have an inalienable right to the finest meats, wines and cheeses if one does not possess the wherewithal to provide these on one’s own.

Through an examination of the ideology employed by the media establishment and the corporate world, it is clear that these institutions in reality care very little for the true meaning of the Christmas message but rather utilize it as a disguise to manipulate the American people into the creation of an elitist regime where the authorities will have more right to your life than you do.

For what other reason could possibly explain efforts simultaneously condemning those daring to mention the Christ of the Yuletide season yet admonishing and requiring citizens to participate in compulsory eleemosynary?

The Lord did indeed encourage us to help the poor and those truly in need, not those too lazy to help themselves. His words were directed towards our own actions, not for elites to bark orders at the rest of us while they sip eggnog and sit around the Christmas tree patting themselves on the back for a spirit of charity they do not possess.

### **Broadcast Charity Drives Full Of Something Other Than Stuffing**

Holidays such as Christmas and Thanksgiving are noted for their many traditions. Turkeys and football, decking the halls and all that stuff.

There is also the less noble tradition of conspicuous feigned compassionate charity on the part of local broadcast news outlets and the shame these glory hogs like to spread around during the holiday season in an attempt to lavish praise upon themselves as embodiments of enlightened progressive attitudes. However, in the light of such efforts, it would seem neither commonsense nor critical observation rank among the virtues heralded by these activist newsmen.

The thing about these charitable drives organized by TV stations is that these efforts would not be undertaken if the correspondents did not have a crew there to chronicle this fallacious eleemosynary in order to pat themselves on the back. At one of these celebrations of self-congratulation documented in the Washington, DC metropolitan area, one reporter interviewed an allegedly “underprivileged” woman with eight children.

Eight children. Mind you, it would be one thing if this woman had one or two kids and fallen upon hard times. In such a case, some kind of assistance might have been justified.

But eight children and unable to provide for herself? In all likelihood, that means she has spawned eight more times than she should have.

Advocates of social dependency and personal irresponsibility will snap, “Would you rather she abort her children?” No, I’d rather she’d exercise a little control and keep her pants on.

Unless she’s been raped eight times (highly unlikely), she should have never gotten herself into this situation. She is a human being, not a breeding sow; it’s about time she act as such.

The promiscuous schooled in the doctrines of “free love” and hedonism will gasp, “How dare you criticize this woman’s private life.” Maybe so, but as soon as this woman stepped forward for a public handout --- be it from either government or charitable institutions --- the matter ceased being a solely private concern.

Of course, one question (maybe eight in this instance) that few have the courage to raise in these cases is where are the fathers of these children. For in this era, most women --- unless they are remarkably devout and if so not likely to require handouts --- don’t usually have that many children by one man.

Maybe broadcasters should plead with these copulating sleazebags to step forward to take personal responsibility for tossing their seed to the wind or do an ambush style interview with each of them as to why they think it’s everyone else’s responsibility to pick up the tab for their fleeting pleasures. It would also make for catchy holiday headlines: “Daddy, why don’t you love me this Christmas?”

After all, if you are the one having the fun, shouldn’t you be the one held responsible for the child’s welfare? It certainly isn’t that of those of us who go to work everyday and keep our noses to the moral grindstone.

Almost as politically incorrect is the observation that many of the indolent clamoring for the rest of us to fill their outstretched hands or suffer the wrath of public shame, humiliation and reeducation aren’t really “poor”. In this age of elastic definitions, poor no longer means being Ethiopian skinny or Appalachian toothless. Poverty, rather, is a conceptualization invoked when the slothful and their patrons in the social welfare racket believe they deserve a higher standard of living than they are willing to exert an effort for in order to obtain.

A number of so-called “single mothers” I am aware of receiving public assistance as well as availing themselves of the bounty of annual school supply charitable drives instead squander the income freed by this misdirected philanthropy to purchase several hundred dollar handbags, go out partying at nightclubs (no doubt looking for the father of their next baby with no intentions of getting married), and on long, shellacked fingernails that would put a fighting cock to shame. Can anyone justify to me why I should pay higher taxes or increase charitable outlays so that the offspring of such women, who barely deserve the honor of being called mothers to begin with, might be able to have a Nintendo set or Nike basketball shoes?

If the rest of us have to squeak by on Ramen noodles and Budding Beef, so should those thinking they deserve better and expect you to pay for it.

As any good parent will tell you, there is more to love than giving an undisciplined child everything they want. Likewise, the greatest gift we might be able to give those claiming to be downtrodden this holiday season is the responsibility of fending for themselves for awhile.

### **Apparently Not The Thought That Counts**

In a land as prosperous as that of the United States, from time to time parents must remind their offspring that the Christmas season is not suppose to be as much about the gift as about the sentiment behind the present. However, as charities themselves degenerate into bloated bureaucracies more concerned about perpetuating themselves than about assisting the downtrodden, those administering these organizations no longer view the giving public as the real heroes behind what use to be considered grassroots eleemosynary but rather as dimwitted cogs to be lectured as to how the acts once perceived as selfless are actually reactionary gestures undermining the progressive vision of their enlightened betters.

Even within my own short life thus far, at one time Toys for Tots was grateful to receive any new toy or even a good used one in reasonable condition (as from my own experience I can tell you that a second-hand Millennium Falcon is as nearly as much a delight as one fresh out of the box). However, like a spoiled child getting too much at Christmas, now not only aren't second-hand toys not good enough for these philanthropic agencies, but now they also dictate what kinds of new ones may be donated as well.

Before having their rears handed to them and deciding to reverse their position as a result of the public humiliation, Toys for Tots initially turned down a donation of 4,000 Bible quoting Jesus dolls not because the figurines might be seen as a tad tacky but rather because the doll might offend non-Christian families such as Jews and Muslims. As a charity distributing its beneficences based upon the destitution of the intended recipients, when was the last time a Jewish family even qualified for goodies from Toys for Tots?

Seriously though, if an individual finds Christmas (and more importantly) the Christ inspiring this particular celebration so odious, why are they accepting gifts anyway? If this charity is being thrust upon the recipients against their will in the same spirit of “we’re doing this for your own good whether you want it or not” characterizing many of the programs directed at manipulating those targeted into accepting their status as “underprivileged”, perhaps its is Toys for Tots that needs the cliched lecture about not imposing its values on others rather than the American people receiving a lecture on the matter from Toys for Tots.

If those paraded before us these days as destitute can be as selective of the charity bestowed upon them as

Jabba the Hutt at an all-you-can-eat buffet, it's about time that a civic dialogue was convened to consider whether or not Toys For Tots has outlived its usefulness. For in the current retail environment with a Wal-Mart in nearly every county and a dollar store in almost every other strip mall, frankly if you can't afford to buy your kid a small toy, a \$0.75 pack of notebook paper, and a Snicker's bar or two, one really ought not to be doing the kinds of things that result in children in the first place.

No where does it say your progeny are entitled to Lionel Trains, Tonka Trunks, or Nintendo Sets under the Christmas tree. Maybe if these parents didn't spend their money on gold teeth, pierced noses, and nightclub boogie dances, they wouldn't need the Marines (or at least the Reservists) to charge in to save Christmas.

Over the past decade or so, one has come to expect secularists to get their dander up over Christmas. Surprisingly, even Christian organizations that don't have all that much of a problem using the Christmas season as an excuse to pander for handouts are now themselves thinking they are too good for the religious underpinnings of Christmas.

Over the last several years, Franklin Graham has earned a reputation for being outspoken about certain trends prominent in the world today. However, if certain developments within the family's ecclesiastical domain are any indication, it seems Junior may have developed a touch of daddy's degenerative spine disorder where one becomes so accustomed to the accolades of world leaders and the influential that such praise slowly becomes just as important as standing for the uncompromised truth.

As part of Samaritan's Purse, Operation Christmas Child is a program organized to distribute Christmas gift boxes to children in impoverished nations around the world. One would think little controversy would erupt as theoretically the program involves little more than the distribution of gift boxes assembled by well-meaning believers and delivered to enthusiastic youngsters.

However, even this has turned into yet another scheme for fostering political correctness around the globe. In being taught a lesson in gratitude and appreciation, most children learn to say a polite thank you and not to complain in front of the giver should they find something they don't care for when they open a present (after all, you can always regift if the giver is not that close of an acquaintance). Yet now contemporary Christian leaders are so concerned about offending international sensibilities (i.e. afraid a Muslim is going to riot) that these ministries have issued elaborate decrees on what the average believer may or may not give.

For example, according to a Daily Mail story entitled, "Christian charity bans Christian themed children's gifts", Samaritan's Purse has expressly banned "war-related items such as Action Man-type figures." So basically anything a young heterosexual adolescent boy would want to play with. Sure, toy cars and planes might still be allowed, but if Ted Haggard hadn't gotten caught letting another man shift his gears, one wonders how long it would have been until these had been banned as well since, according to the limp-wristed pansies coming to predominate the ranks of Evangelical leadership, these modes of transportation are coming to be seen as just as evil as the implements of war (unless of course you happen to be one of those bigshot leaders who will still be permitted to jet around the world telling the rest of us just how evil we are for manifesting the disease of individualism as embodied by driving our own automobiles to work and refusing to carpool).

Peaceniks will respond that the last thing boys need in these mudhole countries is additional

encouragement to make war. If that's the case, I hope the girls will be denied baby dolls as the last thing they need to be encouraged to is to have more kids, though it might be politically incorrect to say, the rest of us are going to have to pay for in terms of foreign aid or as the result of one too many missionary sob stories playing on the guilt pounded into our own psyches over the fact for simply being American.

Unfortunately, there is even more at stake than the lads of the Third World being feminized to the same degree as their counterparts here in the West. For not only is male vitality to be removed but the strength of explicitly Christian convictions as well.

We rubes sitting in the pews with our limited mental capacity would no doubt conclude that the primary reason for sending Christmas boxes overseas would be to tell the children there about Jesus Christ since, as unpopular as the idea might be, those without Him still die and go to Hell even in this age of runaway tolerance. However, our theological betters (at least those in endowed positions that keep reminding us they are our theological betters) would tell us that the best way to tell someone about Jesus is to not tell them about Jesus at all.

For while Christians are free to jam the boxes with assorted miscellany, items of a religious nature are promptly removed. Despite claiming to do it for fear of offending non-Christians, it makes you wonder what percentage of objects attained through this pious five-finger discount end up under the trees and in the stockings of the offspring of Samaritan's Purse personnel.

Frankly, if those these gifts are being sent to are all that hostile towards information about Jesus that mere mention of His name is going to send the recipient into homicidal conniptions, perhaps missionaries to these countries in question should pullback to the lands of the West and fortify our borders by refusing to let anymore from these nations into our countries and work on converting those already here.

Those studying institutional change over time will note that usually religious organizations with even the best of intentions inevitably slide towards theological liberalism. And like the fate that befell the mainline denominations, eventually confusion and distorted purpose will come to grip the administration of Operation Christmas Child and Samaritan's Purse if steps are not taken now to curb the "sensitivity" tide.

Most of the time, a good Christmas story rings with an eternal truth that cannot be denied. It seems the truth in this tale is that you are better off donating your charity dollar to an organization that you yourself have direct contact with such as a reliable church, a family that you know, or maybe your own savings account for when you're old the way Social Security is headed the only charity that will be there to lend you a helping will be you yourself.

Those duped by the professional altruists might be shocked by such a statement. Such noble outrage would be better directed towards those manipulating our sympathies through direct mail fundraising and the like.

## **A Big Helping Of Christmas Guilt**

Retailers have made a science of manipulating consumers during the Christmas season to part with their financial resources for products they would not likely purchase other times of the year. Seems various nonprofit organizations resort to similar tactics to pull off financial transactions not quite as reciprocal in nature.

Most Evangelicals, as well as many Conservatives, know of Prison Fellowship Ministries as the organization, headed by Watergate personality Chuck Colson charged with taking the Gospel of Christ into prisons around the world. One outreach the ministry employs in pursuit of this goal is the Angel Tree Project where presents are given to the children of prisoners on behalf of their incarcerated parents.

While such efforts can be considered laudable, the way in which funds are solicited for the program and some of the assumptions underlying it leave something to be desired. As with many other fundraising campaigns, this one makes ethical appeals of dubious moral logic.

Brother Colson begins his annual Christmas appeal in virtually the same manner every year (those *Breakpoint* commentaries he has ghost written for him must be taking up most of his word-smithing efforts) by laying the guilt on thick by intoning against the recipients of his melancholy epistle, "Over '\_\_\_\_\_ number of' children [the quantity is one of the few aspects of the letter to change from Yuletide to Yuletide] might be alone and forgotten this Christmas if you and I don't reach them through Angel Tree."

Unless there's been a moral coup I'm not aware of, the last time I checked, the delinquent parents were the ones responsible for ruining the holidays (not to mention the other aspects of their children's lives that they neglect) as a result of the consequences resulting from their felonious activity.

Colson continues, "Now I want to ask you to help us in reaching the littlest victims of crime --- the children of prisoners who through no fault of their own are without a parent during critical years of their lives." This is a clear case of putting the paddy wagon before the horse.

Had Mr. Colson not been blinded by his affinity for jailbirds, he would have realized that the children of prisoners aren't the littlest victims of crime after all. That is an infamous distinction belonging to the children of those these scumbags victimized or to children who were themselves victims.

Does Prison Fellowship do anything to brighten the Christmas seasons of these miserable youngsters whose parents --- unlike the ones sitting in the jail cell --- did not abuse their moral freedom? Probably all these kids get is some sanctimonious sermon on how they, if they don't forgive these lowlives for inflicting often unspeakable evil upon them, are in fact bigger sinners than the criminal, a common tactic among pietists seeking a radical ontological leveling.

Whether they realize it or not, Prison Fellowship is inadvertently rewarding criminals for criminal behavior. Just because someone is poverty stricken does not mean they must resort to a life of banditry and mayhem.

Does Chuck Colson therefore care to make a claim as to why children of law-abiding parents are less worthy of Christmas cheer than those with mommy or daddy in the state pen where they belong? Taken to its logical conclusion, maybe economically challenged parents ought to consider going out and committing a crime so their progeny might have a shot at a descent Christmas, or at least the possibility to avoid strafing by these hit-and-run direct mail artists.

Part of the irritating nature of this kind of charitable campaign comes from this and affiliated ministries' questionable philosophy regarding crime and the criminal. For while Prison Fellowship is a step above most other social policy outfits in that it recognizes the role of sin in the penal dynamic, it is surprisingly soft on crime in relation to the beliefs held by many in its conservative base of support.

While it is sad for these children to endure life (not just Christmas) without their parents, it must be remembered that these inmates were not nabbed off the street as part of some cruel, extended “Candid Camera” prank. There use to be the concept of the “Noble Savage” where adherents believed individuals from backwards cultures were somehow morally superior since they had not been sullied by the perceived decadence of more developed nations. Chuck pretty much not only feels the same way about foreigners but about convicts and felons as well.

In a *Breakpoint* commentary entitled “Smashing idols: why God loves the poor” appearing in the November 2003 edition of the Maryland and Delaware Baptist Convention’s *Baptist Life* newspaper, Colson wrote, “...Scripture teaches that Jesus has a special passion for the poor, and who is more impoverished than a prisoner?”

The Bible’s message is the same today as when it was written. However, the way certain words are used today are not.

The poor aren’t exactly what they use to be. Most of those covered by this particular sociological classification are that way because they chose to be or think of themselves that way because they do not enjoy a standard of living they find satisfactory. Don’t come crying to me that you are starving because you have to dine on discount ramen rather than filet minion; I don’t think Jesus had you in mind.

And aren’t we lying to the children when we propagate the illusion that their parents care for them? By giving them a gift with the parent’s name on it, aren’t we in effect saying, “Well Susie, daddy might be an ax-murder, but he’s still a swell guy.” If these convicts were truly outstanding citizens worthy of the continued admiration of their offspring, they would not have committed the deeds that put them behind bars in the first place.

It’s not enough for Colson to embellish the ethical credentials of the statutorily challenged. He must also castigate the self-sufficient in the process.

Colson argues that many Christians have a “middle class” spirit where we want Jesus to save us but aren’t “dependent enough” on Him in meeting our daily needs. Expressing his disapproval of average believers mustering their own resources to solve their daily problems, Colson writes, “When the car breaks down we fix it.” But what else are you suppose to do when you don’t have your own fundraising staff?

While the thinking Christian realizes that the strength and ability to provide for themselves is a gift from God, you’re going to get mighty hungry if you wait around and expect food to plop down from Heaven onto your plate. Maybe if more people abided by those abhorrent middle class values of hard work, self-reliance, frugality, and playing within the rules while struggling to get ahead, there would not be as much need for the services provided by Prison Fellowship and the Angel Tree Project.

As a former government official, I suppose Chuck just can’t get over his need to see individual initiative squelched and dependency encouraged. His problem is probably not so much with Christians not relying on Jesus for their daily needs but instead with them not needing self-appointed ecclesiastical overseers to make decisions for them.

If Mr. Colson was sincere about relying solely upon supernatural intervention to provide for all of his needs, then why is Prison Fellowship soliciting funds? Employing Colson’s own logic, if Angel Tree is within God’s will, won’t finances be made available through slightly more immaculate means?

Interesting how those preaching the loudest against self-reliance hardly ever turn down the fruits of such labor when bestowed upon them as a beneficence of charitable patronage.

If individuals feel led by the Holy Spirit to donate to Prison Fellowship's Angel Tree Project, they should feel free to do so. However, the very least Prison Fellowship can do is resist the urge to become just another voice in the growing chorus whose only carol assigns culpability for the faults of the world onto the shoulders of the common man whose only shortcoming is minding his own business and providing for his own.

### **Ought To Make A Watergate Conspirator Blush**

In Matthew 10:16, Christians are admonished to be as wise as serpents and as harmless as doves. Often though, Christian organizations and ministries are the ones at the forefront of propagating the expectation in the mind of their respective supporters that sincere believers are --- in the words of the Washington Post --- to be uneducated and easy to command.

The Angel Tree Project is a program administered by Prison Fellowship Ministries where Christmas gifts are provided to the children of the incarcerated on behalf of their parents. While there is nothing wrong per se with such acts of charity even though Prison Fellowship mouthpieces such as Chuck Colson get heavy-handed at times that it is somehow the fault of the average American that these misunderstood souls are behind bars and that these convicts are the 21st century equivalent of Rousseau's noble savage or somehow on par with Mother Teresa in terms of moral goodness as detailed in my column "A Big Helping Of Christmas Guilt" published in 2003, one way in which this charitable outreach markets itself to the broader Christian community might make some of Colson's fellow Watergate conspirators blush in terms of its duplicity and slight of hand.

One of the techniques organizations across the religious and political spectrum use to get the unsuspecting and gullible to part with their hard earned money is direct mail fundraising where pity party letters are sent out laying the guilt on recipients that somehow if they do not respond with the requested contribution that the world is somehow going to come to an end. With such melodrama, the least one could ask for is at least a little consistency.

For the past several years and I offer as evidence the letters sent out in 2006 and 2007, though what prompted me to retain the 2006 letter in the first place was its startling similarity to the 2005 letter, that are worded almost identically each of these years. What's the big deal, some may ask, as direct mail fundraising efforts don't come cheap as those composing such epistles can command up to six figure salaries according to a classified employment ad that use to run in Human Events.

Maybe so, but for that price one should be able to get a letter where the errors and convenient oversights are not so easy to spot for the reader who has not left their discernment at the church house door as many have been conditioned to do in this age where it is assumed the statements made by Evangelical superstars are somehow above the scrutiny of we mere mortals.

Both letters center around the plight of an inmate named Richard --- the whys of his incarceration are conveniently omitted as most citizens of good conscience are usually adverse to the sob stories of ax murderers or serial rapists --- who contacted Prison Fellowship in the hopes of getting the Angel Tree Project to provide his daughter with a Christmas present. It is at this point the letters begin to breakdown.



The 2006 edition of the letter reads, “When he wrote this letter, Richard had not been able to send Jennifer a gift for four years.” In the 2007 edition of the letter, it reads, “When he wrote this letter, Richard had not been able to send Emily a gift for four years.”

So who is it? Is Richard’s daughter Emily or Jennifer?

If Richard has two daughters, when why isn’t that mentioned in the letter? Furthermore, why from one year to the next is the impression created that Emily and Jennifer are the same child?

Accompanying the more formal direct mail fundraising request was what looked to be a letter written by the convict mentioned in the letter. In both notes Richard writes, “For I haven’t been able to give her nothing for 4 years and I still have 9 years left.”

Which is it? If in 2006, Richard had not been able to give his daughter anything for four years with there being nine years left of his sentence, in 2007 wouldn’t he have not given his daughter a present in five years with eight years remaining on his sentence? I know jailbirds don’t usually have reputations as scholastic superstars, but it doesn’t take much mathematical aptitude to arrive at that piece of ciphering properly.

The minds of many are so clouded that they will probably be glad to accept just about anything they are told by the Evangelical celebrati. One might even give the benefit of the doubt that maybe the inmate has two children. However, there is one touch to the notes that goes beyond excusableness.

On the back of each of the hand written notes is a picture of a young girl. If the image of a child is to be used to elicit a sympathetic response in the hearts and minds of potential benefactors, shouldn’t marketers have the decency to use a different urchin each year? Is the girl on the letter Jennifer or Emily; for all we know she might be a child not even related to any of the parties in question even though the photo is passed off as such.

Though they mean well, the Breakpoint commentaries produced by Prison Fellowship Ministries have a tendency to make you feel guilty if one enjoys something less than highbrow culture. The very least the organization can do is to aspire to the same level of quality and excellence in the way it decides to raise funds.

### **All America Needs Next Christmas Is A New Backbone**

One might hypothesize that the health of a culture could be determined in part by gauging to what degree those in positions of influence and authority embrace the traditions and beliefs upon which the society rests or the amount of embarrassment these figures exhibit by distancing themselves from these once-cherished notions. If this is the case, then from the attitude towards Christmas taken by overseeing elites, the Western world is in serious trouble with a considerably less magnanimous competitor poised ready to assert the cultural direction those in the realm once known as Christendom no longer seem willing to exhibit.

Objective sociological examination teaches that the Judeo-Christian ethic has enabled the nations employing it as their organizational belief system to ascend to unprecedented spiritual and material prosperity because of that worldview’s ability to balance the potentially competing needs of the individual with those of the group. But as elites conspire to eliminate the trappings of Christmas in their quest for

revolutionary liberation, they end up imposing a sociopolitical control more strident than anything concocted by the most repressed ascetic.

Secularists began this epistemic purge by having the reasonably harmless celebration of Christmas recharacterized as something dangerous to one's mental health or a danger to the nation's conception of liberty. The Colorado ACLU, in cahoots with the Anti-Defamation League, filed a lawsuit demanding that a charter school in that state desist in all mentioning of Christmas, including ancillary renditions of "Jingle Bells", on the grounds of the harm and intimidation such jubilation inflicts upon Jewish students. With everything the Jewish people have endured over the course of their history, I don't imagine those actually in touch with their heritage and simply not as cover to hide their liberal posturing will be too phased by cookies, punch, and verbalized good tidings of great joy.

From labeling Christmas a threat to mental stability it is only a few short steps to removing it entirely --- often over concerns far flimsier than mental harm. Often the threshold for action is lowered to that of mere offense.

Even organizations themselves drawing upon Christian sources for inspiration are rushing to distance themselves from the holiday's religious connotations. According to WorldNetDaily.com, Red Cross stores in Merry Ole England weren't quite so merry this past Christmas as they refused to sell cards depicting traditional religious themes for fear of offending those in regions where the Red Cross conducts relief efforts. The official excuse reads, "Our neutrality is as important in the UK as it is in the conflict zone. We simply cannot put it at risk...Impartiality...in restricted access countries is vital for an international organization that treats people in areas of conflict."

If that's the case, then why invoke the values of care and compassion symbolized by the Cross? If neutrality is to be elevated to the status of the ultimate operational principle kind of like *Star Trek's* "Prime Directive", then why are we rendering assistance to the suffering and infirm to begin with? Wouldn't a dispassionate objectivity simply look upon such individuals as the cost of cosmic humanism's evolutionary quest for a better species?

Wily PR experts within the organization claim the cross has nothing to do with Christian values but rather is a reference to the Swiss flag. But from where did these jovial Alpine inhabitants come across it, from their love of coo-coo clocks and hot chocolate? Most likely it stems from that nation's Christian past.

If that's such an offense to Muslims or other kinds of heathen, so be it. Let them wipe themselves out; they don't have to accept Western relief. We might be strategically better off in the long run.

By implanting reservations about Christmas in the mind of the common citizen, the forces of absolutist secularism move ever closer to their goal of eradicating the Christian religion as the foundation of this civilization. By making the sensitive squeamish about mentioning Christmas, they have moved us to the next level of their program of eliminating Christianity all together.

One might say that working together religion and history become the stream from which all knowledge flows. Tinker with one and you alter the other and eventually everything else with it; undermine one and you undermine the other.

Often the enemies of true religion attempt to elevate their position by postulating that the claims of religion have no place among the esteemed truths of history. But in the process, the facts of history are

manipulated to fit a preconceived interpretation rather than allowing their interpretation to arise from reasonably undisputed facts as transpired in the case of the New York City school system putting the brakes on Nativity displays while giving green lights to Jewish Menorahs and Islamic Crescents on the grounds that the birth of Christ is not historically accurate while the other symbols possess a “secular dimension” apart from their religious significance.

To argue that the Menorah possesses cultural importance transcending its religious value while the birth of Christ possess no historical validity is to be straddling some mighty fine tinsel.

The Menorah earns a place in the Western consciousness because of the role it played in the events surrounding the Hanukkah account. According to the record coming down to us through the Book Of Maccabees, after expelling the forces of Antichous Epiphanes from the Holy Land and reclaiming the Temple, it was found that there was only enough oil remaining to burn for one day but it instead lasted for eight.

This either meant that some Jew messed up in accounting (not very likely) or that God interjected Himself onto the stage of history to contravene the normal operations of natural law for the accomplishment of His purposes. Such a contingency might be classified as a miracle.

But if He was willing to extend a few measly drops of oil for His people at the time, why wouldn't He intercede in a manager in Bethlehem with the salvation of all mankind --- both Jew and Gentile --- at stake? Why, in the eyes of New York school officials, are we to accept one historical account surpassing the parameters of normality but not the other?

One might expect such nonsense to emanate from the bowels of New York City since it is, after all, renowned as a cesspool of liberalism and there are some people even mass tragedy of historic proportions won't change. The attempt to eliminate public recognition of Christian belief and culture is probably a greater danger when undertaken by institutions purporting to be more wholesome and American in nature.

The Carroll County Farm Museum in Westminster, Maryland exists to remind this rapidly developing suburb of the Washington/Baltimore Metropolitan Area of its more agricultural past. As such, one would assume those entrusted with its upkeep would endeavor to execute their responsibilities as custodians of such a heritage with the utmost respect and accuracy.

Each year, the Farm Museum decorates the house and grounds, providing visitors a glimpse into the wonders of Christmases past. Yet if the tour's official program is to serve as any kind of guide to the kind of Christmas spirit being promoted in the name of the good people of this reasonably conservative Maryland county, it is one of post-Christian revisionism.

The purpose of the publication titled *Origins Of Christmas Traditions* is quite self-explanatory. However, the document goes out of its way to avoid those inconvenient facts clashing with the pagan/secular hegemony liberal opinion makers wish to foist upon the American people.

For example, regarding stars as decorations, the text reads, “Stars have held religious significance for many cultures. Three stars represented God for the Babylonians; the Egyptians believed gods controlled specific stars; the six pointed Star of David became the symbol of the Hebrew nation; and the Blackfoot Indians associated every star with a human spirit.”

That's all well and good, but it would leave Paul Harvey hanging as it's only part of the story.

When families gather in their homes each December, it's not the glories of ancient Egypt they assemble to honor at this stage of our cultural development when fathers stretch to place this beloved ornament atop the tree. It's rather the Star of Bethlehem mentioned in Matthew Chapter Two that guided the Wise Men to the Christ Child that this gesture commemorates.

It is not enough for those out to alter our nation through attacking its foundations to casually omit an inconvenient fact here or there. These subversives have no qualms about resorting to outright fabrications in pursuit of their cause.

Regarding candy canes, the Christmas tour booklet records, "Legend has it that the choirmaster at Cologne Cathedral...asked the sticks be bent to symbolize a shepherd's crook...No one knows when the red stripe was added; it appears on Christmas cards of the 20th century."

No one? That's a rather absolutist proclamation coming from relativists. Is it really that no one knows or that no one can provide a satisfactory answer secular enough in nature?

The mystery of the red stripe is not that much of an enigma. And frankly, the Carroll County Farm Museum's exposition of the candy cane is as half-assed as a lop-sided mule cart.

The candy cane was not only designed to resemble a Shepherd's crook, but also doubles as a "J" standing for Jesus when turned upside down according to some sources such as "The Legend Of The Candy Cane". The white has come to symbolize Christ's purity and the red no one wants to talk about the Blood He shed for our sins.

But while the once-Christian West blushes in embarrassment at its historical traditions in a manner similar to teenagers at the site of their baby pictures, there is a competing outlook increasingly in our midst that does not shame away from its public manifestations as characteristic of many so-called Christians and that has no qualms about imposing its beliefs upon others often through means harsher than reasoned persuasion. But perhaps the most disturbing thing about it is the complicity and complacency of Western thinkers and leaders in their own conquest.

For while the radically tolerant do everything within their power to sweep Christianity under the rug, they gush with a multicultural naiveté in enthusiastically going out of their way to accommodate the public display of Islamic rites and practices. In the eyes of some liberals, when Islam comes into view the Humanist's ballyhooed separation of church and state suddenly gets as lost as a needle in the Arabian Desert.

An excellent yet disturbing example of this phenomena occurred at a public library in England where a church was forbidden from placing a notice about its Christmas service on the bulletin board because such an act might be seen as endorsing a particular religious preference and thus offend adherents of other faiths but where librarians had previously held an official function recognizing the end of Ramadan. An allegedly "Conservative" councilor remarked of complaints about the inconsistency in the *Telegraph*, "I am appalled at the attitude of these so-called Christians making such a fuss about this policy. The way they have reacted to the children's party is just shocking." In other words, you'd better be quiet and have a smile on your face as we toss you to the lions.

This font of jurisprudence continued, "It is quite a different thing having a party organized by a library to promote cultural understanding and accepting notices for religious services." Thus it is proper for a government agency to endorse a hostile religion bent on the destruction of almost everything good and pure but an ecumenical crisis of monumental proportions erupts for simply allowing an independent, non-affiliated ecclesiastical entity to place a notice in a forum which, by definition, ought to be open to promoting community events.

But if those making tolerance their purpose in life really want to embrace Islamic values, who are we to complain? I would have no problem with having four subservient wives required to beckon to my every call and who could be properly be put in their place should they dare get out of line. For supposedly longing for understanding, these libraries are appalling ignorant of the world as it actually is despite being surrounded by books, instead preferring their own little La-La Land.

Yet there is more at stake than the luxuries and privileges currently enjoyed by uppity feminists. For while the culturally effeminate might cringe at any truth beyond their beloved pseudo-truth that there is no truth, their Islamic counterparts aren't as assured of the propriety of keeping one's beliefs to oneself. In fact, many of this persuasion are fanatically insistent their ideas are best for you to live by as well whether you want to or not.

Americans had better know what they are in for before they allow adherents of this religion to acquire too much influence or to increase in number beyond what is socially prudent. For though it might come as a surprise to those intoxicated by contemporary leftist conceptions of tolerance, activist Muslims aren't exactly renowned for devotion to classic democratic-republicanism or traditional conceptions of innate liberties.

The Saudi official who formulated the religious curriculum used there and in Islamic schools abroad, essentially making him the terrorist counterpart to Bill Bennet, believes slavery is still appropriate under Islamic law and that any Muslim who says otherwise is an infidel (and we all know what Muslims of the good sheik's persuasion want done to infidels). He also opposes elections, political assembly, a free media, and wants to behead Muslims criticizing the Saudi brand of Islam.

Apologists might counter that such sentiments represent just one faction within the Islamic faith just as not all Christians agree on how their faith should be implemented either. But if Saudi Arabia is to Islam what the Vatican is to Roman Catholicism, such an assertion would insinuate that what those speaking on behalf of the Pope had to say is of little diocesan consequence. While this analogy is not absolute, it is not without merit since the Saudis propagate an ecclesiastical influence beyond their kingdom by sponsoring mosques and religious schools around the globe.

Some Christians sensitive to the less than kosher origins of December festivities due to their pagan origins before they were baptized with Christian meaning might think it trivial to elevate Christmas to the level of one of the major battles of the epic culture war gripping American and world civilization on almost all fronts. But whether you're inclined to have a holly jolly Christmas or not, you have got to realize that "the holiday season" isn't going anywhere; the issue rather becomes whose ideas are going to predominate the day in the minds of men.

Some Neo-pagans are more than happy to oblige Christians forfeiting the day over the occultic origins of certain symbols by reimbueing them with their ancient pre-Christian meanings. For example, one sect of

nature worshippers suggests decorating your “solstice tree” with pagan symbols. Instead of placing an angel atop it, I guess you’d hang Al Gore or Oprah Winfrey figurines from the branches.

Likewise, more than fruity garden heathens are out to co-opt the festive time at the end of December in support of their own nefarious agendas.

Traditionally, merchants have used the noble sentiments of Christmas to both spread goodwill while earning a little profit at the same time. However, since the word “Christmas” has been denigrated to a level lower than profanity in the annals of liberal lexicography, statists and corporatists are compelled to fabricate another celebration around which to organize and promote values.

In the revolutionary spirit of the new holiday order, the Bank of America one December sponsored the advertising plastered across the bags the Prince George’s *Gazette* was delivered in. This bag was not covered with quaint trees or cute elves wishing all a Merry Christmas. Instead the bag read, “Kwanzaa brings the gift of community together in celebration of family, unity, and pride. Bank of America Kwanzaa gift cards are a perfect way to remember those you love this Kwanzaa.”

Too bad such a crock can’t be bagged inside the bag it was scribbled across. Use to be the sentiments expressed above were placed within a Christian context in recognition of the Christmas spirit, but in light of the meaning of Kwanzaa, are they even something we want to celebrate?

In the multiculturalist ethos of the early 21st century, Christianity is bad mouthed in part on the grounds of being “exclusionary”. After all, Christ Himself said in John 14:6, “I am the way, the truth, and the life: no man cometh unto the Father, but by me.”

Pretty narrow, eh? But if you think so, isn’t Kwanzaa even more so?

For while the gift of Jesus is available to anyone coming unto Him regardless of race or ethnic background, Kwanzaa is for the Black community alone. If it’s racist for White folk to prefer the company of other White folk, to patronize White businesses for no other reason than that they are owned by Whites, or to feel a certain sense of accomplishment for having simply been born White, then why should Black ones get a free pass? Without Christianity to infuse them with meaning, unity, community, and even family become nothing more than pawns in the onward march of socialistic racialism.

Christian thinker Ravi Zacharias once observed that culture is the effort to provide a coherent set of answers to the existential questions that confront all human beings. If attacks such as these continue, Americans might end up losing more than their eggnog and stockings hung by the fire. They could wake up one Christmas morning and find themselves without their country as they once knew it as well.

-----

Frederick Meekins is an Internet columnist and a blogger. He holds a Bachelor of Science in Political Science /History from the University of Maryland University College, a Master of Arts in Christian Philosophy & Apologetics from Trinity Theology Seminary, a Doctor of Practical Theology in Interdisciplinary Studies from the Master’s School of Divinity, and a Doctor of Divinity from Slidell Baptist Seminary. Dr. Meekins is pursuing a Ph.D. in Christian Apologetics through Newburgh Theological Seminary. His blog is the [Epistolizer](#).